CONTROVERSIES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

by

St. Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J.

Translated from Latin by
Kenneth Baker, S.J.

Keep the Faith

KB

© 2016 Keep the Faith, Inc
All rights reserved
ISBN 978-0-9912268-6-3
Library of Congress Control Number
Printed in the United States of America

CONTROVERSIES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

by

St. Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J.

INDEX OF THE BOOKS

THE FIRST GENERAL CONTROVERSY ON THE WORD OF GOD..... 7

I. On the sacred and apocryphal books..... 21

II. On the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and common Latin versions..... 102

III. On the interpretation and true meaning of Scripture..... 174

IV. On the unwritten word of God..... 214

THE SECOND GENERAL CONTROVERSY
ON CHRIST, THE HEAD OF THE WHOLE CHURCH..... 269

I. On the true divinity of Christ..... 274

II. On the personal distinction from the Father and the Holy Spirit, and on the procession of the Holy Spirit..... 379

III. On the truth and majesty of the flesh of Christ or the Incarnation..... 458

IV. On the soul of Christ and his descent into the underworld..... 520

V. On the office and merit of the mediator..... 570

THE THIRD GENERAL CONTROVERSY ON THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF 595

I. On the primacy of St. Peter in the Church militant..... 608

II. On the succession of the Roman Pontiff in that primacy..... 722

III. On the Antichrist: he has nothing in common with the Roman Pontiff..... 847

IV. On the power of the Roman Pontiff in spiritual matters..... 953

V. On the temporal dominion and power of the same Pontiff..... 1054

THE FIRST GENERAL CONTROVERSY
ON THE WORD OF GOD

EXPLAINED IN FOUR BOOKS

INDEX OF THE BOOKS AND CHAPTERS OF THE FIRST CONTROVERSY

Foreword 5
Life of St. Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, S.J. 7
To the Reader 11
Preface 13

BOOK ONE

ON THE SACRED AND APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

I. Is Scripture the word of God? 21
II. The books, which are called canonical, contain the word of God 23
III. An objection taken from the words of St. Paul is refuted, the written word kills, but the spirit gives life 27
IV. Which books are sacred? 32
V. On the heretics what have attacked books of the Old Testament cited above .. 34
VI. On the heretics who have attacked the books of the New Testament cited above .. 40
VII. On the book of Esther 44
VIII. On the book of Baruch 52
IX. On certain chapters of Daniel 54
X. On the books of Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Sirach, and Maccabees 58
XI. On the book of Tobit 63
XII. On the book of Judith 64
XIII. On the book of Wisdom 70
XIV. On the book of Ecclesiasticus (Sirach) 73
XV. On the books of the Maccabees 74
XVI. On certain parts of the books of Mark, Luke and John 80
XVII. On the letter to the Hebrews 82
XVIII. On the epistles of James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John 89
XIX. On the Apocalypse 95
XX. On the apociyphal books 98

BOOK TWO

ON THE HEBREW, ARAMAIC, GREEK AND COMMON LATIN VERSIONS.

I. It is shown that the Hebrew edition of Mosesand the prophets never perished. 102

II. Whether the Hebrew version has been corrupted..... 105

HI. On the Chaldean version..... B1

IV. On the Aramaic version..... П3

V. On the various Greek versions..... B5

VI. On the translation of the LXX elders..... 117

VIL On the Greek version of the New Testament..... 123

VIII. On the Latin versions..... 125

IX. On the author of the Vulgate version..... 127

X. On the authority of the Latin Vulgate edition..... 133

XI. Objections of the heretics against the Vulgate edition are answered..... 137

XII. The places in the Vulgate edition are defended, which Kemnitius says have been distorted..... 140

XIII. The places in the Psalms, which Calvin contends were badly rendered by the Latin translator, are defended..... 145

XIV. The places are defended which the heretics say have been corrupted in the Latin edition of the New Testament..... 151

XV. On the vernacular editions..... 156

XVI. The objections of the heretics are answered..... 164

BOOK THREE

ON THE INTERPRETATION AND TRUE MEANING OF SCRIPTURE.

I. Scripture is not so clear by itself that, without some explanation, it suffices to end controversies about the faith..... 174

II. The objections of the adversaries are answered..... 179

HI. A question is proposed about the judge of controversies, and at the same time there is an examination of the senses of Scripture..... 184

IV. Testimonies from the Old Testament are cited for the opinion of Catholics.... 189

V. The same point is proved from the New Testament..... 192

VI. The same point is proved from the usual practice of the Church..... 196

VII. The same point is proved from the testimonies of Pontiffs and Emperors..... 199

VIII. The same point is proved from the testimonies of the Fathers..... 201

IX. The same point if proved from reason..... 205

X. The objections are answered..... 207

BOOK FOUR

ON THE UNWRITTEN WORD OF GOD

I. On those who have mainly defended or opposed the unwritten traditions..... 214
II. What tradition is and its various forms..... 215
III. The state of the question is explained, and the some lies of the adversaries are uncovered..... 217
IV. The necessity of Traditions is demonstrated..... 222
V. It is demonstrated from the Scriptures that there are some true Traditions..... 228
VI. The same idea is shown from the testimonies of Pontiffs and Councils..... 232
VII. The same idea is proved from the Fathers..... 233
VIII. The same idea is proved by four other arguments..... 244
IX. Five rules are explained by which we can acquire knowledge of the true Traditions..... 246
X. The objections of the adversaries, which are taken from the Scriptures, are answered..... 249
XI. Objections from the Fathers are answered..... 256
XII. The reasons of the adversaries are answered..... 264

FOREWORD

St Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) was the chief Catholic theologian during the latter part of the 16th century and at the beginning of the 17th century. His literary production was immense, since he produced books and treatises on most areas of theology, including Scripture, Christology, Sacraments, Liturgy, Ecclesiology and Eschatology.

Among his major works are the three Controversies contained in this volume. Basically they are his own private notes that he used for his lectures at the Roman College in Rome from about 1576 to 1592. In his own preface he apologizes for the many abbreviations and for some of the other defects that occur in the text. The reason for this is that there was a request by many that these notes be published, even though he was not able to correct them and prepare them for publication. Consequently some of the references are not clear because they are in Latin abbreviations of his own making.

Controversy I deals with the Bible. In it he proves that the Bible is the revealed word of God and that it contains no errors, that is, he proves the inerrancy of the Bible. These three volumes are called "controversies" because from beginning to end he is refuting the false accusations and errors of the Protestants who denied most of the articles of the Catholic faith, such as the integrity and inerrancy of the Bible, the Mass, purgatoiy, prayers for the dead, most of the Sacraments, the primacy of the Pope, the infallibility of the Pope, the divinity of Christ, the humanity of Christ, and so forth. He always refers to them as "adversaries" or "heretics," but he never calls them "Protestants."

Cardinal Bellarmine presents several arguments in defense of the reliability and accuracy of the Septuagint (LXX) Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible which was made about the year 200 B.C. He also defends the integrity of the Vulgate Latin translation of the Bible which was made by St. Jerome around the year 400 and has been used in the liturgy of the Catholic Church since that time.

Controversy II contains Bellarmine's defense of the Church's teaching on the divinity and humanity of Christ. In great detail he refutes the 16th century heretics who deny either the divinity of Jesus or his humanity. He also proves the distinction of the three persons in the Trinity and shows that the Second Person, or Word of God, is the one who assumed a human nature and is Jesus of Nazareth. He also presents arguments to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son and that there is full justification of the addition of the "filoque" to the Nicene Creed.

Controversy III is centered on the Sovereign Pontiff, the Bishop of Rome. First of all he proves the primacy of Peter among the twelve Apostles, and that that primacy is passed on to his successors as the Bishop of Rome. Peter and his successors are the Vicar of Christ and as such, by the will and power of Christ, govern the whole Church. They are the ultimate teachers of the faith; they are the ones who decide what the true faith is when there are disagreements or debates about such issues. Bellarmine presents many arguments from Scripture and Tradition to prove these points.

Saint Robert also argues for the infallibility of the Pope in defining matters of faith and morals. And on this matter he was a key theological source at Vatican Council I when the infallibility of the Pope was solemnly defined as an article of faith for Catholics.

According to Bellarmine, the Sovereign Pontiffhas supreme power over spiritual matters in the Church. He has the power to appoint and to remove bishops; he gives bishops their power ofjurisdiction; he has the power to approve general councils, so that councils without his approval have no authority in the Church. He also refutes at great length the false accusations ofProtestants like John Calvin that the Pope is the Antichrist. At the end ofthe Controversy III he shows that the Pope does not have direct temporal power over nations and territories, but he does have a certain indirect power when nations enact laws that deny the faith.

In all three Controversies he is refuting the errors of many adversaries of the Catholic Church, who were veiy vocal in the 16th century and published many books attacking the Catholic faith and traditions. His favorite targets are Martin Luther and John Calvin, but he also argues against many other heretics whose names are not familiar to contemporary Catholics.

These three Controversies are works of great scholarship. It is amazing how many books and authors he cites. His favorite authors in defense of Catholic faith among the Latins are St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Irenaeus and Tertullian; among the Greeks he often cites Saints Chrysostom, Basil, the two Cyrils, and Gregory Nazianzen. Since the Protestants recognized the divine authority only ofthe first seven General Councils, those are the ones he cites most frequently. Rarely does he cite St. Thomas Aquinas, Lateran Council IV, and the Council of Trent which occurred during his lifetime.

Robert Cardinal Bellarmine was greatly admired by bishops and Catholic theologians during his lifetime and was famous for his scholarship and preaching. He was the theologian and counselor for several Popes. He was called another Augustine, another Athanasius and "the hammer ofheretics." He was greatly detested by Protestants because ofthe power ofhis arguments to prove that they were in error. In fact, he was so detested in England that lectures were instituted at Oxford and Cambridge in order to refute his arguments proving that they were in error and outside the true Church of Jesus Christ.

This book contains the translation ofthe three Controversies which were given originally in Latin. The translation was done during the year 2015 at Bellarmine Preparatory School in Tacoma, Washington. In his comments on the book Mr. Robert Modarelli, President of the School said: "Saint Robert Bellarmine's masterful command of contemporary scholarship and wide, deep understanding of both contemporary Church doctrine and the most prominent challenges or heresies it faced during the 16th century are vividly evident throughout the books. Fr. Kenneth Baker's groundbreaking translation now makes available in English this one of Bellarmine's most important and influential works."

I wish to thank the Jesuit community there and the administration of the school for their support in making this important defense of Catholic truth available in English for those who would like to know more about the theology and thinking of St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J. In fact, this book offers a summary of the arguments of the Protestants during the 16th century against the Pope and the Catholic Church, and their refutation by the prince oftheologians, who lived during those turbulent times.

Kenneth Baker, S.J., *Translator*
Bellarmine Preparatory School
Tacoma, Washington, January 1,2016

LIFE OF ST. ROBERT CARDINAL BELLARMINE, S.J.

[This is an edited translation of a brief essay on the life of St. Robert Bellarmine, S.J. It was published in 1676 by Fr. Philip Alegambe, S.J. and Fr. Nathaniel Sotuello, S.J., fifty-five years after the death of the saint- Translator]

St. Robert Cardinal Bellarmine, an Italian, was the son of Cynthia Cervinae, sister of the Sovereign Pontiff, Marcellus IL As a youth he consecrated himself to God in the Society of Jesus on September 20, 1560, at the age of eighteen. He learned the liberal arts, taught them, and professed them with excellent talent, good judgment and diligent study. He was an excellent preacher and with great admiration of all, because of his young age, and with outstanding results he preached in famous places, even before he was a priest. He was ordained a priest in 1560 at Ghent by the bishop of the city, and then he was sent to teach sacred doctrine at Louvain, where he was the first Jesuit to preach in that city. He had an auspicious beginning, although he had not studied all the questions from the first and third parts of the *Summa theologica* of St. Thomas. However, the favorable report, which he stirred up in his mastery of theology, was known far a wide, so that it was exceptional; hence, he was the first in the academy to receive honors, and he was considered by all to be a master teacher.

Since he crowned such praise of wisdom with an equal increase of virtues, on July 6, 1572 he was ordered to add the fourth solemn vow of Jesuits to the other three vows, which by a decree of Pius V was permitted after the assumption of the priesthood. After spending seven years in Belgium he returned to Italy, and at Rome he was the first to give lectures in 1576 to young Jesuits on the controversies of the faith. He did it with such brilliance that he far surpassed his already famous reputation. In the year 1590 he was sent by Pope Sixtus V to France with the legate, Henry Cardinal Cajetan, so thaL if questions arose about matters pertaining to the faith, he would assist the Cardinal. Then having returned after ten months, at the command of Gregory XIV, being one of the few men assigned to the task, he corrected the Holy Bible of the errors, which had crept into the first edition ordered to be published by Sixtus. He composed the Preface, which is still studied today, and he corrected the Bible that had been authorized by Gregory XIII, whose Aramaic version was full of rabbinic errors.

In 1597 he was the rector of the Roman College, and before he completed his three years he was named the provincial of the province of Naples. He administered both offices to the great benefit of his companions, and then at the death of Francis Cardinal Toledo he was summoned to Rome at the beginning of the year 1597 by Pope Clement VIII in order to take his place in the curia. Shortly thereafter he was added to the number of consultera for the holy Inquisition. And when he became the rector of the Penitentiaiy College, after less than two years on March 3, 1599 he was named a Cardinal by the same Pope Clement. On that occasion the Pope said: *We have chosen him, because the Church of God does not have anyone equal to him with regard to doctrine, and because he is the nephew of a very good and holy Pontiff.* But when he wanted to refuse this honor, under the threat of an anathema he was forbidden to refuse ῖζ and thus for the good of the whole Church, the signs of being a cardinal

were given to him as he wept. Then it happened that although he was clothed with the sacred purple, still he changed nothing in his former modesty, and he remained as he was before, and as a poor priest of the Society of Jesus and a prince of the Roman Church he was always the same joining together as one the offices of the religious life and of sacred dignity. Three years after receiving the purple he was named the archbishop of Capua by the same Pope Clement on April 21,1602, with the strong approval of the sacred college, as Cardinal Baronius said. His administration of that Church was excellent; this was especially evident when, because of the death of Pope Clement VIII, he had to go to Rome for the new election. For, when he said goodbye to the people from the dais, and indicated that he would not be returning, tears were shed by all, and then there was a public outcry, as they all said: *Do not leave us, good pastor, do not abandon us. We orphans under your direction will change our ways where we have sinned.* The next day there was a mournful city, and as soon as the Cardinal appeared in public there was a tearful outcry of the people, calling him their pastor, parent, teacher—and lamenting his departure: some kissed the hem of his garment; others piously touched him with their rosaries, all begged for his blessing. The new Pontiff, Paul VI, immediately after his election, forbade Bellarmine to depart from his side, since he wanted to make use of his counsel. For this reason he had to resign from the Church of Capua, which he could not govern because he could not be present with them.

Robert Bellarmine lived in the purple and was busy with many affairs of the Church until the year 1621. At that time because of his advanced age and illness he asked to be relieved of his public responsibilities. On August 16 he left the Vatican and went to the Jesuit house of formation, St. Andrew's. Shortly thereafter he began to be taken by a fever and when he knew he was about to die, he was heard singing: *Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word.* It cannot be expressed in words how joyful the thought was for him of his approaching death. He desired greatly to show his contempt for living any more and his incredible thirst for eternity. Pope Gregory XV visited him at his bedside; twice he embraced him lovingly and promised that he would offer Mass for his health. The Vicar of Christ showed great reverence for him, and used the words of the Centurion: *Lord, Iam not worthy that you should enter under my roof.* After being strengthened by the Sacraments, he asked Fr. Andrew Endaemonianus, a close friend, to testify in writing that by the mercy of God he was dying in the Catholic Church and in the faith, which until that day he had cultivated with a sincere mind, and defended with his books; and he should testify that as he is dying he does not think otherwise about the divine assistance, or ever did think otherwise, than what he taught in the books of controversies. When he felt that the hour of his happy transition was imminent, he prayed often the Apostles' Creed, Psalm 51, the Lord's Prayer, and the Hail Mary, while constantly repeating the holy names of Jesus and Mary. Then he placed the sacred image of Christ nailed to the cross on his head so he could venerate it and crossed his arms on his breast and finally with a gentle sigh peacefully he rendered his spirit to his Creator on September 17,1621 at the age of 79.

At the command of the Pontiff a funeral was conducted for him with the same splendor with which Cardinals customarily are buried, but to control the huge crowd that came to kiss and touch his remains it was necessaiy to make use of the Swiss Guards. After ten days the Society buried him in a tomb and Tarquinius Gallucio gave the eulogy. Whatever material

things he made use ofwere soon taken by admirers for the sake ofveneration. At the beginning ofthe next year, his body was placed in an empty tomb next to that of St. Ignatius. To this Odoardus Cardinal Farnese added a plaque made out ofprecious stones and a monument with various statues, along with a suitable, laudatory inscription.

Now perhaps it is better to remain silent about the piety of Robert Bellarmine, his devotion, his humility, his modesty and other virtues, and also his miracles and prophetic predictions, along with his other endowments. It will be enough to present a few statements about him coming from famous individuals.

Marphaeus Cardinal Barbarini, who is now reigning as Pope Urban VIII, said about Bellarmine when he was still living that he considered him to be a saint, and that he did not hesitate in a hymn to make him an equal in virtue with St. Charles Borromeo.

Cardinal a Monte said that God wanted to give to the Church this perfect model so that the holy senate and our centuiy might be enlightened by him, as the previous century was by St. Charles Borromeo.

Cardinal Estes calls him a singular example for our time, whom he does not honor as a cardinal, but honors as a saint, and because ofhis death the Church ofGod has suffered a great loss.

Cardinal Verallus says that he so lived as a model that the cardinals and all ecclesiastics can learn virtue from him; that he wrote in such wise that he can be considered another Augustine ofour time.

Cardinal Cobellutius says that because ofhis death the crown has fallen from the head of the sacred senate, and that he was the bright light ofthe holy Church.

Cardinal Ubaldinus thinks that in this century no one was greater than he in defense of the holy faith, that deservedly he can be called the Athanasius and Augustine of our time; finally, that in doctrine he is like the holy doctors ofthe Church, in virtue a mirror ofholiness, in purple a model for ecclesiastics.

Cardinal Centinus calls him the hammer ofheretics, the bulwark ofthe holy Church, a pillar ofthe Christian faith, the champion and defender ofthe Catholic faith.

Cardinal Valerius said that he had not found so many virtues in the many men worthy of praise, whom he had known, as he had found in this one great athlete ofΟιτί5ζ in this great apostle ofour time.

Cardinal Ursinus praises in him chastity in a corrupt age, in which he is like Joseph; poverty in the midst ofriches, as in David; freedom in extreme poverty, as in Tobias; interior solitude in the midst ofactivity, as in Gregory; a humble opinion ofhimselfwhile being filled with many excellent virtues, as in St. Paul; finally, a free voice towards rulers, as in John the Baptist.

Cardinal a Sabaudia honored him because of the miracle of doctrine whereby as the bulwark ofreligion he attacked the heretics, and he praised him because ofhis integrity and holiness.

Cardinal de Sourdis calls him a star, the hammer ofheretics, the prince oftheologians of our time.

In a summary way I will mention a few things said about him from other sources: he has been said to be the teacher and model ofthe perfect and heavenly life, who during his time

had no one greater than he; he is a strong colossus of the Church of God, a holy athlete of faith and a fierce enemy of heretics; he is a new Antoninus in aiding the poor; a Basil in the perfection of life, an Irenaeus destined by divine providence to refute heretics; he was never sufficiently praised in our time, and always will be praised by posterity; he is a teacher, leader, counselor, great senator of the Christian republic; a great pillar of the Church; a light shining in a dark place, driving away all shadows; very knowledgeable of divine things; a treasure of the highest order of his age; conqueror of heresies, a new Alcides of the north; a brilliant star of Christian piety and of eveiy kind of learning during our centuiy; an immortal ornament of the holy Roman purple; he was placed by God in the middle of the Church as a bright and shining light; the leader of a holy army, the great glory of his own time; and there are six hundred more statements of this kind, which are omitted for the sake of brevity. Hence the renown of this well-known Cardinal continued for fifty years and during this time his holiness was recognized more and more, so at the direction of Pope Clement X finally the process was begun in 1674 by the Sacred Congregation of Rites to examine his life and miracles in order to number him among the blessed, if all the necessary requirements are fulfilled.

Robert Bellarmine was a prolific writer. One of his main works is: *The Controversies of the Christian Faith against the Heretics of His Time.* This is a scholarly and detailed work contained in three volumes with 64 sections, which he called "books." The first volume appeared in 1581, the second volume in 1583, and the third volume in 1592. And after that it went through twenty editions just in the northern countries; and famous authors say how important it was for the Church of God. Cardinal Perronius says that it helped him more than any other work which has been published during the past thousand years in defense of the Church. Cardinal Baronius thinks it is the bulwark and tower of David on which a thousand bronze shields hang, and all the arms of the brave, so that our Jerusalem can be defended against the attacks of enemies. Others call him the primary antidote against the heresies of this time, the wall and defense of the house of God. The enemies themselves have not dared to deny this, among whom Theodore Beza should be mentioned. "This one book," he said, "has knocked all of us to the ground." Therefore, first at the university of Cambridge in England, and soon thereafter at Oxford new lectures were instituted in order to refute, if they could, the controversies of Bellarmine. Here is an outline of this massive work:

Controversies I: On the written and unwritten Word of God, in 4 books;

Controversies II: On Christ, the Head of the whole Church, in 5 books;

Controversies III: On the Sovereign Pontiff, Head of the Church Militant, in 4 books.

In addition, Bellarmine published books and treatises on Catholic doctrine and liturgy. For example, he wrote about general councils, purgatory, the blessed in heaven, indulgences, the Sacraments, sanctifying grace, the Psalms, the Apostles' Creed, the decrees of the Council of Trent, the ascent of the mind to God, on the Hebrew language, on the apostolic liturgy; also there are sermons and various letters of Bellarmine. Most of it is in Latin, some in Italian, and most of it has not been translated into English.

Now for the first time the three major Controversies are available in English in this one volume.

TO THE READER

Three important reasons, O Christian reader, have motivated me to allow these disputations of mine to be published. The first reason moving me is that I think that it will not only not hinder, but also benefit the ecclesiastical cause if several authors write at this time. The opinion of St Augustine is also known by many and it is worthy to be recognized by all, namely, that it is to be desired, where heresies are thriving, that those who have some skill in writing, should write, even though they write not only about the same things, but also perhaps write about the same things with different words. For, it is necessaiy that the heretics understand that in the camps of Catholics there is not just one or the other writer, but many, who are ready to engage them head on. Moreover, there is this advantage from the writings of many authors that Catholic books more quickly and easily are put into the hands of all, and, since some confront others, still all are equipped with the same weapons in the common danger. Both the examples of the ancient Fathers and daily experience confirm this opinion of a veiy prudent and learned man. At one time when the Arian heresy was raging, a veiy laige number of both Greek and Latin authors wrote accurately and extensively: Athanasius, Basil, Epiphanius, Didymus, both Gregorys, both Cyrils, Hilary, Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great Idacius Clarus, Phaegadius, Fulgentius, and others. Thus they agree among themselves, and in a sense work together; and they all seem to repeat and inculcate the same things, and they all drew from the same source. And that usually is not and cannot be attributed to them as a vice. For, what many wrote was the cause for ardor of the faith, and zeal for religion, which the Holy Spirit ignited in their hearts. That they wrote the same things came about because they drew the antidote for the same poison from the same fount and the same Spirit; with God being their source and leader, they fought with the same helps against the same enemies for the possession of the same thing.

But if those ancients both wrote with such passion and urged others to write, since the world was suffering from one or the other heresy, and among the heretics not many were writing, and the art of typesetting had not yet been invented, which from one volume of a book quickly produces many copies for distribution; in our century this is now possible and so innumerable heresies attack the Church from all sides, and those are rare among the adversaries who do not write something. Now their books do not creep like a cancer, but they fly around like a swarm of locusts. And finally, it is certain and clearly established not only that daily the heretical writings infect many men with a plague, but also at times bring destruction to entire provinces. Therefore, this was the reason why I allowed these disputations to be printed; for otherwise I would never have allowed them to see the light of day. But there is another reason that moved me even more strongly.

At this time writers of all orders and nations have published excellent volumes, and common enemies of the same mind have fought very hard against the cause of the common faith. And although someone endeavors to explain one argument and has worked with all his strength to treat it accurately, still there are today in the individual areas of controversy of the various authors several learned and (which was necessary) very long disputations; but not many enjoy so great an abundance of books and such leisure, so that from such varied and prolix disputations they can understand all the controversies in a short space of time; nor can they easily equip themselves with the helps and weapons they need in order

to defend in a manly way all the articles of the faith, namely, those who must perform the office of shepherd and teacher among the Germans, French, English, Poles, Bohemians, Pannonians, Illyricans, Swiss and other nations suffering from heresy. Wherefore after the learned works of outstanding men, it also seemed desirable that all the controversies should be gathered together in one place and that they should be so proposed and explained with certain reason and in a way so that in a short space of time, at a reasonable cost and without great effort, those who wish can get their weapons from one armory with which they can be equipped, and can stand in the battle line against the enemies without being in great danger. Now I have tried to do this not according to my own will, but I do it at the command of my superiors. I leave it to others to judge whether or not I have succeeded. Moreover, since the nature of writing seemed to be the most useful, we have published these disputations, so that those who wish to do so may use them, until something better and more polished is produced by someone else who is more gifted with talent and leisure in this same field.

The third reason remains, which not only motivated me, but clearly forced me, as I said in the beginning, to commit these labors of mine to posterity. When Gregory XIII of blessed memory, the Sovereign Pontiff, in order to bring help to the German and English nations, instituted two excellent colleges in the city of Rome for German and English youth, that is, in the citadel of religion, it was required of me from the province that I explain the controversies of the faith to the students in those colleges as carefully and clearly as possible. And in my poverty I was to prepare, as it were, new soldiers of the Church who were to return to their own provinces with copies of these lectures. Therefore, when that occasion was offered, I began the work and I initiated a way of disputing so that I might include all the controversies concerning the faith, and so that I could treat them partly in their members and join and connect them partly with others, so that one would be combined with another, and another would depend on and be bom from another, and from all of them one whole and perfect body of doctrine, complete in all its parts, would exist. Our disputations were delivered first of all to the students in our college in the course of their instruction; then they were written down by many again and again not without great labor and expense; and having been taken to various places, such demands began to be made for their publication that some even threatened to have them printed against my will. Therefore I have been forced to publish this work which is still in a rough and unpolished state (for, not being impeded by the daily task of teaching, I was able to improve it somewhat), lest to my great sorrow I perceive the disputations set in type by others and received in the schools in a mangled and mutilated way and full of many errors.

It is my wish, dear reader, if there is something in these commentaries, which can be of use to you for the glory of God and the advancement of the Catholic Church, that you make use of it and give thanks not to me, but to the one God who is the author of all good. But if in your reading something should occur, which often happens, that is either too brief, or too little consistent, or said less properly and elegantly, please remember this: these commentaries were not originally written with the intention of publishing them, but in order to help my memory for my class lectures; also, it is necessary to pay attention not to how something is said, but to what is said.

PREFACE

DISPUTATIONS ON THE CONTROVERSIES OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AGAINST THE CONTEMPORARY HERETICS

DELIVERED IN THE ROMAN COLLEGE
1576

I am beginning to argue about the controversies of the faith against all the heretics of the present time, and to gather together in one place many diverse questions, and like the members of one body, according to my ability, which I ask God to strengthen abundantly from heaven, to bring them all together. This is surely a difficult task, and certainly, at least in my opinion, of such a nature that it must be treated not lightly and perfunctorily, but accurately, and as the dignity and difficulty of the matter demands: knowing that it requires almost infinite knowledge, not only of the different disciplines and languages, but also of all antiquity, of all history and times. I know that I have some knowledge of all these things, even though it may be small, nevertheless it is necessary for me to carry the burden placed on me and to bring it to completion: but I will at least strive to compensate for my weakness by hard work and diligence. And I will try to bring it about that, when all the other defenses and helps of doctrine are lacking to us, study and diligence certainly will not be missing.

But before I begin to discuss the proposed questions, it seems to me that something should be said about the usefulness of these disputations: then I will give a brief explanation of the nature of the contemporary controversies and how many there are of them.

Now the usefulness of the disputed questions proposed to us can be easily understood because they comprehend the more important and the more necessary part of all theology. For, we have to deal not with a little bit of water or soil, not with little things of no importance, whether they are this way or that way; not with metaphysical subtleties, which can be ignored without danger, and sometimes can laudably be opposed; but we are dealing with God, Christ, the Church, the sacraments, justification, the nature of grace, free will, and many other very great and difficult questions, which pertain to the very foundation of faith. If someone wishes by disputing to corrupt even one of these truths, as St. Augustine wisely said in book 1, chapter 2 in his *Contra Julianum,* that necessarily destroys everything we believe about Christ. So it is necessary to recall heretics to the light of faith, or at least to stop their attacks and madness, to keep those wild beasts away from the Lord's flock, to protect the Church, to liberate the little sheep from the fangs of wolves and to restore them to the sheepfold of the Lord; indeed, how very useful this is, how much a cause of true joy, and what an abundant field of glory. But he will never accomplish any of this who has not first of all studied these questions carefully and at length; since he must have diligently prepared himself with the weapons of the Church, and have learned to render harmless the weapons of enemies and to turn them back on the enemies themselves.

Now lest our lecture be thought by some to have less value, because they judge the

plague of heresy to be less important than it really is, since they perhaps reckon it among the common vices and sins, which daily are remitted by the sacrament of penance, and then they think that they are healed, therefore, I will say about the gravity of heresy not everything that could be said, nor even many other things lest my lecture be too long; but I will say just a few things, which, since they seem to be necessary, will suffice for now.

For, I will omit what St. John Chrysostom said in his homily to the people of Antioch (#50) and what St. Augustine said in book 21, chapter 25 in his *The City of God,* namely that they consider the heretic to be much worse than the Gentiles or the publicans. I will not mention things that are wont to upset people as the violent winds agitate the seas. Similarly, heresy, once it invades a territory, soon stirs up in it riots, battles and seditions: I will remain silent, that our ancestors, when they were caught up in other persecutions, waited for the enemy with tranquil souls; but when they were involved in a war of faith, then all were moved in their hearts, so that they were not satisfied unless they gathered together all the powers of the Church, and all of them, with a common effort, rushed as one to resist the heresy. No one left his own place in order to extinguish other vices; but in order to repel heresy, they did not hesitate to abandon their homes and provinces, and to go to far distant places with the greatest danger of their goods and life. An almost infinite number of other things I pass over willingly in silence, even though in no small way they might help me. But I will say this one thing—that the perversity of heresy is much greater than all other evils and afflictions, just as a plague is more terrifying and fearful than common, everyday illnesses.

There are two things that truly make a plague something to be feared and avoided above other diseases. The first one is that it diffuses its poison with great speed all the way to the heart, and almost in a moment of time it destroys a man who shortly before was healthy; the second is that, after it has killed one man, it kills another hundred, and it travels far and wide so fast that today it invades one home, and in a short space of time it fills the whole city with cadavers.

Heresy is exactly the same in souls as a plague is in bodies. First of all, without any controversy or doubt faith is a gift of grace which we receive from our heavenly Father in conversion and justification, the first movement of a renewed heart, the first sense of the spiritual life. Hence, shortly after faith the mind is moved to hope, the will is inflamed with love, the tongue is loosed for confession, the hands are put to work. Therefore, when heresy immediately assails the heart of the soul, it both removes completely the gift of grace and extinguishes that beginning of divine and heavenly life. What can be thought to be more pernicious and pestilential than the disaster of heresy?

According to the confession and opinion of all, faith is the first foundation of the spiritual edifice. For, because of it the walls of hope are constructed, the roof of charity is spread over it, and then many different ornaments of good works are added to it. The house of God, St. Augustine said in sermon 22 on the letters of the Apostle, by faith has its foundation, by hope is erected, by love is completed; therefore, when there is disruption and movement in this edifice, it is not located in the roof or in the walls; it plows up and overturns the basic foundations—and that is what heresy does. How great, I ask you, is that ruin? How great is the loss? Then what part of hope remains, when no

part of the edifice remains, but the whole structure collapses at the same time under that blast? The first ray of divine light, which he illuminates in our hearts—he who called us out of the darkness into his wonderful light—what is it but our faith? For from it, like the beginning of dawn, the light of the justified proceeds, and grows, as the wise man says, to the perfection of the day.

Since, therefore, heresy suddenly steals the day away from the human mind and does not leave even the first light of dawn: What is more horrible than heresy, more miserable, more deadly? I will say these things now more plainly. If any Catholic falls into sin, if he should by chance commit a theft or adultery or homicide: he is certainly in a miserable state. But nevertheless, since some sense of life is still present, the foundation of the edifice is still there, the light of dawn is still there, there is faith in him; he has many great helps for his eternal salvation; he is not walking in the darkness and he knows who his physician is; he can still call out to God from the faith he has—he can build on that foundation, he can appeal to the Savior of all, and implore his clemency and mercy; the maternal bosom of the Church is not lacking for him, and all the sources of spiritual medicines are available to him. But the heretic has none of these helps, but when the light of faith has been extinguished in his heart, he is left with empty shadows and phantoms. He does not know where he is going, and the more he runs the more he loses the right road, and he finds himself always in denser shadows, until from the interior darkness, which he suffers in his soul, he arrives at the exterior darkness which is in hell. And this is not an amplification, but rather a continuation.

Does not the thickest and palpable darkness seem to you to be poured out on those who, since they want to be seen as the wisest of all men, nevertheless at times say things, make known in public, and try to sell those things for the gospel which even boys and decrepit old women understand to be dreams and nonsense? What can be imagined to be more impious and stupid than to make God, who is the source of goodness and justice, the author of all evils and shameful crimes? But Peter the martyr does this in his commentary on the Second Book of Kings, and John Calvin also in his *Institutes* (chapter 4,18 § 4).

What is more childish, and inept, than to say that God in a rock is really and truly a rock; in iron that he is iron; in a tree that he is a tree; in an offering that he is an offering; in all things that he is all things? But Michael Servetus teaches this in his sixth letter to Calvin. What is more absurd, not only contrary to all reason but also to all common sense, than to openly assert that infants, when they are baptized, based on the example of St. John the Baptist, with their internal senses perceive certain divine motions, hear the promises of the Gospel, and make an act of faith in the promises of God? But Martin Luther openly says this in his commentary on the third chapter of the Letter to the Galatians; and the leaders who followed him said the same, without showing respect for St. Augustine, who in his letter to Dardanus answered this question: Whether because of the singular case of the Baptist it is credible that all infants have the use of reason before they are bom; and because of Balaam's ass, who spoke wisely on one occasion, that men should be advised to expect some asinine counseling in their deliberations.

Then, who would not be amazed that men can be found who have persuaded themselves that nothing else is required for the justification of the impious than that

they are certain they are justified, that their sins have been forgiven, so that now one's opinion does not depend on the truth of things, but rather that the truth of things depends on one's opinion? Nevertheless this incredible paradox is the fourth article in that famous Augustine Confession; this is a main point of the heretics of our time with regard to the Gospel.

Now what shall we say about John Wycliffe? Here is his sixth article which was condemned at the Council of Constance in session 8: *God must obey the devil.* What shall we say about John Calvin who, in his *Institutes* (chapter 2,16), seriously and deliberately teaches that our Lord Jesus Christ (which certainly pious ears refuse to hear) for some time endured the pains of hell along with the damned and the reprobate? Afterwards there were also those who said that Christ on the Cross fell into despair, and so was condemned to hell. What punishment is suitable for the soul of someone who has fallen into such darkness, who could think up such impiety?

But where shall we place those words of Martin Luther, which he wrote in his book on the councils: *A short time before I consulted with the Nestorians, who argued against me very obstinately that the divinity of Christ could not suffer!*

Behold, O Christian reader, those who have made shipwreck concerning the faith, who do not suffer so much from errors as they do from madness; they are surrounded with darkness into which they have fallen; and still I have not wanted to mention the even more absurd mysteries of the Anabaptists and libertines. Behold with what great miracle God separated Israel from the Egyptians, where Israel, that is, where the Catholic Church of Christ is, there is light, so that absolutely all, from the greatest to the smallest, may recognize the way of justice and of truth; but where the Egyptians are, that is, the heretics, there the darkness is horrendous and palpable, so that also frequently it affects the human senses themselves.

And would that the heretic would injure only himself, and not immediately spread his poison far and wide; but truly the Apostle wrote that the words of heretics are spread like a cancer; ours is a rich witness of this. For, who does not know that the Lutheran plague, which started in Saxony, soon encompassed almost all of Germany? From there it went north and east—to Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Pannonia, Hungary. Then it went west and south with equal quickness, and in a short space of time it invaded France, England, Scotland, which had been flourishing kingdoms; it travelled over the Alps and penetrated as far as Italy.

Therefore, so that those infected with the plague cannot contaminate others, they are rightly excluded from contact with others; thus, we do not dare to enter their homes or even to touch anything that belonged to them; thus the authority of our ancestors forbade the Christian faithful to have anything to do with the books of heretics, their conferences, their lectures, their assemblies, and this was wisely advised already from the first beginning of the Church. There is to be no commerce with such persons (according to St. Cyprian in his third letter of book 1), no meals or conversations; let us be separated from them just as they are fugitives from the Church. And St. Leo said in his 18th sermon on the passion of the Lord: "Avoid poisonous conversation with heretics; we have nothing in common with those who are opposed to the Catholic faith and are Christians in name

only." Also St. Athanasius in his life of the great Anthony said: "Anthony so detested heretics that he told everyone not to have anything to do with them." And the Apostle Paul, while speaking often and seriously about heretics, had this to say: *Avoid them.* And St. John the Apostle and Evangelist, as Irenaeus says in book 3, chapter 3 in his treatise against Valentinus, on one occasion when he was about to enter the baths, and when he learned that the heretic Cerinthus was there, he immediately left the area without taking a bath; indeed, by his example he wished to warn all future generations that heresy is a contagious disease, and it is to be avoided with all one's strength and with the greatest mental foresight.

When the Arian heresy was raging, the Church of Samosate understood this very well. For, as recorded by Theodoretus *(History,* book 4, chapter 4), since in that city the people were Catholic, and the bishop was a heretic, the bishop was preaching in the church, but he was talking only to the benches and walls: for all fled from him as being infected with a plague; the bishop went to the baths, and others who happened to be present he invited to bathe with him; but while he was present no one ever entered the place; and no one would bathe afterwards, unless first the water was drained and new water was added. On one occasion boys were playing in the square, but it happened that their ball touched the foot of the horse on which he was riding; immediately all cried out, and after a fire had been started in that large square, they threw the ball into it.

Such was the zeal of the old Catholics, such was their striving for piety, such was their ardor for the Catholic faith, which if Germany, if Bohemia, if England, if France, if the other peoples had wished to imitate them, surely we would have another type of State; if at the beginning at least that diligence had been employed to suppress heresy, which we often see used in order to wipe out a plague: certainly many members of the Church, whose salvation is in a desperate state, would until now remain whole and incorrupt. But when, because of our sins, the plague of heresy has grown so strong, and increases daily, and our affairs have been brought to such a great and public crisis, and a remedy can be applied to such great evils only after a long time and with great effort and sweat on the part of many: this one thing remains, that the sons of the Church, and especially those who have been called by the Lord to help others, diligently prepare themselves to resist the heretics. This will take place, if they take sufficiently great care and efforts to know both those things brought against the Church and what belongs to the Church. For their studies we ardently desire to offer some assistance, namely, this present work, and with the help of God we are confident of help for others in the future. This is what we thought should be said about the usefulness of our disputations.

Now I will say a few things about which controversies we are going to treat and how many there are of them. The enemy of the human race, although otherwise he is wont to be totally perverse and a disturber of good order, still he wishes to attack the truth of the Catholic Church not without a certain orderly procedure. Therefore, in the first two centuries from the foundation of the Christian Church, he was totally occupied in trying to destroy the first article in the Apostles' Creed. For, what else did they want—the Simonians, the Menandrians, the Basilidians, the Valentinists, the Marcionists, the Manicheans, and the whole school of the Gnostics—except that there is not one God,

the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth? But when he did not succeed in that, again at a later time about 200 years after the Lord, the devil established a new front, and he began to attack the second article of the Creed in which the divinity of Christ our Lord is explained. For, from that time we have Praxeas, Noetus, Sabellius, and also Paul of Samosate.

After the year 300 Photinus, Arius, and Eunomius appeared; they either did not distinguish the divine person of Christ from the Father, and therefore, as Hilary says, they denied it; or they made his divine nature different from the nature of the Father, and for that reason they argued that it was not truly divine but only created. But since even then the gates of hell could not prevail against the Church, the devil, now taking a new third approach, began to oppose with even greater strength the third and at the same time the fourth, the fifth, the sixth and the seventh articles, because they have a certain connection and relationship with each other.

Therefore he stirred up Nestorius and Theodore of Mopsuestia after the year 400. Then a little later, Eutyches and Dioscorus; around the year 500 Peter Gnapheus, Severus of Antioch, Julius of Halicarnassus; after the years 600 and 700 James of Syria, Cirus of Alexandria, Sergius, Pyrrhus and Paul of Constantinople; finally, all that innumerable posterity of Eutyches, split up into many small sects, whose descendants still to this day are found in the Orient.

All of these, even though different among themselves and using contrary tactics and tricks, strove to destroy and overturn the last five articles of the Apostolic Creed concerning the one and the same mystery of the divine Incarnation, and also of the passion, of the resurrection and of his coming to judge the living and the dead.

For, the first ones, proclaiming that there are two persons in Christ—one divine and one human—and separating the divine Christ from the man Christ, wanted him to be only a man but not also God who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and so they attacked him with great force in order to destroy him. For, around the year of the Lord 860, during the time of the Roman Pontiff, Nicolas I, the schism of the Greeks took place, which separated them from the Apostolic See and the churches of the west (this is what I think, though others think differently). The reason for this schism is that error of the Greeks, which had been refuted in so many councils, by which they contend obstinately that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son. For, even though long before that Macedonius denied that the Holy Spirit is God, and Theodoretus denied that the same Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son; nevertheless at that time Satan was busy attacking the true divinity and humanity in Christ, as an article of faith which pertains to the Holy Spirit, and especially that part which has to do with his procession from the Father and the Son.

But certainly, when our cunning enemy realized that he was accomplishing very little by attacking those articles of faith, which pertain to the divine persons, he then dedicated himself completely to upset and destroy the truths concerning the Church and the sacraments. These two articles—I believe in the holy Catholic Church, the communion of saints and the forgiveness of sins, with all of his tricks and efforts, with the power of hell he has tried to pervert, and he is still trying even to this day; this has been his strategy

since the year one thousand down to the present day; his forces have often been changed, increased and renewed—by the Berengarians, Petrohrussians, Waldensians, Albigentians, Wycliffites, Hussites, Lutherans, Zwinglians, Confessionists and Anabaptists.

But this often seems amazing to me and worthy of note that Berengarius, as the author and parent of the heretics of this time, with his three errors laid down the foundation of the three major sects, to which at this time all the others can be reduced: namely, that of the sacramentarians, of the confessionists and of the Anabaptists. For, the first error of Berengarius was that the true body of Christ is not present in the Eucharisζ but the Eucharist only signifies it. The sacramentarians accepted this error as their own. There was another error of the same kind, which he contrived after his second recantation, namely, that the true body of Christ is in the Eucharist, but it is there together with the substance of the bread; and the Augustine Confession adopted this and all the Confessionists still maintain it. The third error of the same Berengarius was that infants are not to be baptized and marriages are not to be contracted, since all women are common to all men, as Guitmundus said in book 1 against Berengarius; but that very position is the faith and doctrine of the Anabaptists.

Since, therefore, almost all of the heresies of the present time pertain to these two articles of the Apostles' Creed, the ninth and the tenth, we also will direct all these controversies to these two articles. Therefore, in the beginning we will speak about the holy Church; in this dispute the first thing to be treated is Christ himself, who is the head and prince of the whole Church. Then we will treat the part of the Church which is active on earth and also her visible head, the Roman Pontiff; we will also consider all of her members, that is, clergy, monks and laity. After that we will treat the other part of the Church which is suffering in Purgatory. Then we will consider the Church triumphant with Christ in heaven and, in connection with that, divine worship and the invocation of the saints, relics and images and other similar things. When that has been accomplished, we will move on to consider the communion of saints, that is, to the treatise on the sacraments, where there will be as many areas of controversy as there are sacraments. For, almost everything our theologians affirm about the sacraments, the heretics of this time deny completely. Finally, the forgiveness of sins follows, to which all those questions pertain which are about the grace of the first man, about the loss of grace, about the wounds remaining from sin, about the recovery of grace, about free will, about justification, about the merit of good works.

Furthermore, the controversy concerning the word of God will precede all of these questions, like a long and important Introduction. For, there cannot be a dispute, unless first of all we have some agreement with our adversaries on a common principle. But there is an agreement between us and all the heretics that the word of God is the rule of faith. Based on this, one can make a judgment about dogmas: that it is a common principle conceded by all, and therefore arguments can be drawn from it. Finally, we are agreed that it is a spiritual sword which in this battle cannot be rejected. Nevertheless there are many questions about that very same common principle. For, some accept only an internal word of God; others an external word, but only the written one; others partly written, partly handed down by oral tradition. Also, some consider these books and others those books as the word of God. Some think that this edition must be used, while others

think it is that edition. Some think that Scripture is very clear in itself, others that it is obscure and they contend that it must be interpreted. Finally, some teach that the meaning of Scripture must be sought from the internal revealing spirit, while others seek it from the Church and her Supreme Shepherd. All of these questions must be handled at the beginning, so that we may have something from which we can establish other truths. But the Index of the whole work will explain all of this more fully.

BOOK ONE

On the sacred and apocryphal books

CHAPTER I

IS SCRIPTURE THE WORD OF GOD?

As I begin to discuss the sacred books, first of all this question presents itself: Is the prophetic and apostolic Scripture to be accepted as the word of God? Or is that only to be considered as the word of God what the Holy Spirit speaks privately to each person in his heart? This question, which is considered unworthy elsewhere among Christian theologians, has been presented to us at this time partly by the folly of Shwenkfeld and the Libertines, partly by the depravity and the impudence of the Lutherans. Gaspar Shwenkfeld (as Fredericus Staphilus in his book on the harmony of Luther's disciples, and Peter Palladius in his book on the current heresies testify) rejected the written word as a killing letter, and commands us to be content with the internal spirit alone. On the Libertines, who take their origin from Copinus and Quintinus, John Calvin has this to say in his instruction against the Libertines (chapter 9): *Now we have said that in the beginning they openly laughed if someone should choose the Scriptures; and they did not hide the fact that they considered them to be fables. But at the same time they did not cease to use them, if there was a passage which they could twist to their own advantage. It is not that they put faith in them, but only to upset the simple, and to agitate them in such a way that finally they could more easily convert them to their view. If a text presented an objection to them, they responded: We are in no way subject to the letter, but it is necessary to follow the spirit who gives life. Also that man, Poreus Quintinus, censured each one of the Apostles with scoffing comments, like Picardicus in his sermon, when he said that Paul was a broken vessel, that the youthful John was stupid, Peter a denier of God, Matthew a usurer.* These are his words.

Furthermore, Martin Luther, and John Calvin, and all their followers and disciples, did not fear to ascribe this error of Shwenkfeld and the Libertines shamelessly to the Roman Pontiff and to the whole Catholic Church. The words of Luther in his book on the Councils and the Church, near the end, go like this: *The Pope in this matter has filled up almost the whole world with a huge pile of commentaries and books, and has converted it into real snares of consciences—laws, tributes, divine and human rights, articles of faith, the name of sin and justice. So it is a good thing that his decrees should be cast into the fire, for the Church can easily be without such a book, which did horrible and irreparable damage to a large part of the human race; he has covered the sacred Scriptures with ashes and he has destroyed almost all of Christian doctrine.* These are the words of Luther; similar things by him are read passim in his book against

the King of England, and in his book on the false state of the clergy, and elsewhere. The words of Calvin at the beginning of his book or instruction against the Anabaptists are the following: *For we do not speak the way the Papists do, that it is necessary to set aside the Holy Scriptures so that we may follow human authority; for, we think that this approach is a detestable blasphemy.* Wherefore, in order that we may briefly refute both the error of the former and the lie of the latter, this first of all will have to be established: that the prophetic and apostolic books are to be understood according to the mind of the Catholic Church, as explained both formerly in the third council of Carthage (chapter 47) and recently in the Council of Trent (session 4), namely, that it is the true word of God and the certain and steadfast rule of faith. Now we will prove this with the following arguments.

CHAPTER II

THE BOOKS, WHICH ARE CALLED CANONICAL, CONTAIN THE WORD OF GOD

TO begin with, Moses, the prophets, Christ himself, John, the Apostles, either themselves confirmed the divine dogmas from the Scriptures, or certainly exhorted other to read the Scriptures, and they never encouraged anyone to neglect the Scriptures and rely on the judgment of the inner spirit. Their testimonies will be quoted by us not because we think we will be highly esteemed by our adversaries; but lest the Scriptures, whose authority the adversaries sometimes abuse as being against us who really venerate them, seem to be working in their favor.

Moses, therefore, in Deut. 17:8 said: *You will do whatever they have said—those who rule in the place which the Lord has chosen and have taught you according to his law.* Here clearly Moses is teaching that the controversies arising among the people of God are to be judged by the law of the Lord. In the same way also Isaiah cries out in chapter 8:20: *Pay more attention to the law and to the testimony.* And Malachi in chapter 2:7: *The lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and men should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.* David also said in Psalm 119:2: *Blessed are those who keep his testimonies.*

But Christ first of all confirmed his legation by the testimony of Scripture when he quoted the words of the prophet: *The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me, etc.* Then in Mark 12:24 he refutes the Sadducees from the divine writings, when he says: *Is not this why you are wrong because you know not the Scriptures?* And below that: *And as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, etc.* Then in Matt. 22:46 consider how he imposed silence on the Pharisees with another argument which he took from David. And again, he refuted the same Pharisees by appealing, not to some internal spirit but to the divine Scriptures, when he said in John 5:39: *Search the Scriptures.*

Indeed John the Baptist used as a witness of his own legation not the judgment of an internal spirit, but the prophet Isaiah: when he was asked who he was, he said (John 1:23): *I am the voice of one crying in the wilderness, "Make straight the way of the Lord, 'as the prophet Isaiah said.* Concerning the Beroeans, it is mentioned not without praise in the Acts of the Apostles (chapter 17:11), that, when they had heard the Apostle Paul, they examined the Scriptures daily to see if these things were so. And the Apostles themselves—Peter, Paul, John, James, Jude—not only frequently use the testimonies of the law and the prophets in their individual letters, which would take too long to recall here; but sometimes they also preach absolutely the authority of the Scriptures. Thus St. Peter says in 2 Pet. 1:19: *We have the prophetic word made more sure. You will do well to pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a dark place.* And St. Paul said in 2 Tim. 3:15-17: *From childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings which are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.* Finally, God himself said in Joshua 1:8: *This book of the law shall not depart out of your mouth, but you shall meditate on it day and night.* Therefore those who contemn the sacred writings and the divine oracles are fighting with Moses, with the prophets,

with the Apostles, with Christ himself, and with God the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Next, the rule of the Catholic faith must be certain and known. For, if it is not known, it will not be a rule for us; if it is not certain, it will not even be a rule. Moreover, a private revelation of the spirit» even if it is certain in itself, still cannot in any way be made known to us, unless perhaps by some divine testimony, that is, it is confirmed by true miracles. They especially labor under an extreme lack of such miracles who no less than the others drive away the spirit. For, who will believe me that the Anabaptist is not lying when he says he is inspired by the Spirit? But how do I know that spirit—that it is a spirit of light and not a spirit of darkness? And since so many at this time boast that they have the Holy Spirit as their leader and teacher, and nevertheless among themselves so disagree in their opinions that they are heretics to others, certainly it cannot be that all of them are thinking correctly. But if all either are in error, or which is absolutely certain, some of them: who will dare to say that there is not from among their number those who are being deceived by the spirit of Satan?

But nothing is more known, nothing more certain than the sacred S criptures, which are contained in the prophetic and apostolic writings. It is necessary that he is most stupid who denies that faith should be put in them. For, the Christian world and the consensus of all nations bear witness that they are veiy well known; for many centuries now they have always had the greatest authority among many peoples: they hold that those writings are most certain and true, that they are not a human invention, and that they contain divine oracles.

First, the truth of the prophecies is a witness and on this point St. Augustine says this in book 12, chapter 9 of *The City of God*, The faith of Scripture not undeservedly has wonderful authority in the world and among all the nations, which have received them, among the other true things which it said, it foretold things with true divinity.* And again in chapter 10 he said: *Those writings are much less worthy of belief which they wanted to produce and are full of ancient fables, contrary to the authority of the well-known and divine books, which predicted that the whole world would be entrusted to him, and in whom the whole world believed as he had predicted: he showed that he narrated true things about the past, because what he foretold about the future actually came true.*

Secondly, another witness is the incredible and fully divine harmony and agreement of so many men, who wrote the sacred volumes in different places, time, languages and occasions, that they do not seem to have been so much different writers as different pens in the hand of one author. Therefore rightly Theodoretus in his preface to the Psalms and St. Gregory in his preface to Job thought that the tongues and hands of the sacred authors should be called nothing other than the writing instruments of the Holy Spirit.

And St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 41 of *The City of God,* said about this admirable harmony of the Scriptures: *Let our authors, among whom the canon of the sacred books is fixed and bounded, be far from disagreeing in any respect. It is not without good reason, then, that merely a few people prating in the schools and gymnasia in captious disputations, but so many and great people, both learned and unlearned, in countries and cities, have believed that God spoke to them or by them, that is, the canonical writers, when they wrote these books. There ought, indeed, to be but few of them, lest on account of their multitude what ought to be religiously esteemed should grow cheap; and yet not so few that their agreement should not be wonderful. For among the multitude of philosophers, who in their works have*

left behind them the monuments of their dogmas, no one will easily find any who agree in all their opinions.

The third witness is God himself, who at times with heavenly attention defends his own scripture from human profanation. Since, indeed, when Ptolemy the king was wondering why no one knew about the divine books—neither the historians nor the old poets, Demetrius Phalerius responded, as Josephus reports in book 12, chapter 2 of *Xht Antiquities,* and Eusebius in book 8, chapter 1 in *Preparation for the Gospel:* This scripture is divine, and it was given by God himself, therefore if any profane men wanted to touch it, being struck by God, they would immediately draw back. And he also said that a certain Theopompus, who wanted to add some embellishments in Greek to the divine books, suddenly, having experienced some mental agitation cause by God, since he was vehemently disturbed, was forced to abandon the work he had begun. He also mentioned Theodectes, the tragic ροβζ who had decided to translate something from the divine scriptures into a fable and was afflicted with darkness in his eyes; thus in this sudden calamity he ceased immediately from his great temerity.

The fourth witness is Scripture itself. If its predictions of future events were true, as was proved when they actually took place, why are not the testimonies of present things also true? Therefore, what David says in 2 Sam. 23:2 is true: *The Spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my tongue.* What Zechariah says in Luke 1:68ff. is true: *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel... as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old.* What Peter says in 2 Pet. 1:21: *Men moved by the Holy Spirit spoke from God.* And Paul in 2 Tim. 3:16: *All scripture is inspired by God.* Finally, it is true what all the prophet repeat again and again: *Thus speaks the Lord.*

Lastly, there is a witness in the almost infinite number of divine miracles, which have taken place in every century in order to prove the dogmas that are contained in these books.

Therefore since Holy Scripture is the certain and safe rule of believing, he surely will not be in a healthy state who, having neglected them, commits himself to the judgment of an internal spirit, which is often fallacious and always uncertain. And St. Augustine, in the prologue of his book on Christian doctrine, rightly admonished Christians with these words: *Let us be on our guard against such proud and dangerous temptations, and recognize that the Apostle Paul himself, although knocked down and instructed by the divine and heavenly voice, still was sent to a man in order to receive the sacraments and be joined to the Church; and that the Centurion Cornelius, even though his prayers had been heard and his alms recognized and an angel spoke to him, still he was put in the hands of Peter, through whom he not only received the sacraments, but also heard what he should believe, what he should hope for, what he should love.*

One can add to this that the providence of God so rules and moderates things according as the nature of each one demands: but the nature of man requires that, since we are endowed with a mind and a body, we grasp bodily things more easily than spiritual things; through the things that are perceived by the sense of the body, as it were by steps and grades, we are led to spiritual and heavenly things. Therefore, God does not teach all generally by an internal inspiration what is to be believed about himself, or what he wishes to be done by his own creatures; but he willed to instruct us through corporal writings which we can both see and read. *From that city, from which we are travelling* (Augustine said in sermon 2 on Psalm 90),

the letters have come to us; they are the Scriptures which exhort us to live well.

But if David, Moses, Isaiah, Peter, Paul, John, and a few others admitted in some measure to the society of the angels, did not draw their wisdom essentially from the fount itself of truth, immediately also the rest of men had no need either of the divine letters or any teachers, since there must be one reason for the foundations, another for the walls, another for mountains, another for hills. Are all Apostles? Are all prophets? Are all foundations? Are all mountains? And if all are mountains, where are the hills? If all are foundations, where are the houses? If all are apostles and prophets, where are the synagogues of the people? This was written about in Ps. 7:7: *The assembly of the peoples will be gathered about you.* We therefore are built (as the Apostle say in Eph. 2:20) on the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, by whose preaching and letters we are instructed; but those who saw, and were ministers of the word, are sustained by and founded on the great cornerstone, Christ Jesus.

When the sun rises, the tops of the mountains are illuminated; but after that the light comes to the hills and then to the lowest valleys. Thus according to Psalm 72:3, the mountains bear peace for the people, and the hills, in righteousness. *The mountains* (said St. Augustine in treatise 1 on John) *are lofty souls and the hills are small souls, and therefore the mountains bear peace and the hills can bear justice. What is the justice that the hills bear? It is faith: because the just man lives by faith. However, the smaller souls do not bear faith, unless the greater souls, which are said to be the mountains, are enlightened by that wisdom so that they can communicate to the little ones what they can understand.* And after that he says: *When we lift up our eyes to the Scriptures, because they have been produced for us by men, we are lifting our eyes up to the mountains, from whence help will come to us.*

Finally, if in a human republic all the laws and the directions of predecessors were abolished, and it were permitted to each person to do what he thought best and just according to his own natural prudence, would there not be a great disturbance of all things? Would not great confusion follow? Would not the whole republic be destroyed in a short space of time? However there is no one who does not know something about human affairs, and who is lacking completely in judgment. Therefore, what would happen, if in that society, which is divine rather than human, and in which many things above natural reason must necessarily be believed, in which many things beyond human power must be done, the sacred sayings, divinely inspired, were taken away, and only an internal inspiration is to be hoped for and followed? What would happen, since the greatest part of men are those who are simple and uneducated, who judge that nothing has been given to them by God and have never perceived anything in their sleep; therefore, what about them? Will they always be waiting? In the meantime will they believe nothing? Will they perish forever? Or will they obtain justification without faith? Or beatitude without justification? But the Shwenkfeldians and Libertines have arguments, with which they confirm and defend their own opinion, namely, so that they may not seem to rage without reason. Let us now see what those reasons are.

CHAPTER III

AN OBJECTION TAKEN FROM THE WORDS OF BLESSED PAUL IS REFUTED: THE WRITTEN WORD KILLS, BUT THE SPIRIT GIVES LIFE

The Apostle Paul, they say, *with eloquent words distinguishes the letter from the spirit, and he openly rejects that word of the Old Testament, which he also says is killing; but he says that the spirit is proper to the New Testament, and he calls it living. He says in 2 Cor. 3:5-6 that our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code, but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life. Therefore, since the Old Testament is for the Jews, and has nothing to do with Christian men; so neither do the divine scriptures, which are nothing other than a written code, pertain to Christian men.*

It is easy for us to respond to this argument, and first of all, if that is the way things are, and the sacred writings have nothing to say to us, why does Christ himself say in John 5:39 *Search the Scriptures?* Why did Paul write so many letters? Why did he advise his disciple in 1 Tim. 4:13 to attend to the reading of Scripture? But surely the Apostle Paul did not wish to understand by the killing word, the words of Holy Scripture; nor by the living Spirit some internal speaking of the Spirit. For Paul the letter and the Spirit are not different things, as for John the law and grace. *The law,* he says in John 1:17, *was given through Moses, grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.* And St. Augustine says in book 15, chapter 8 of his *Contra Faustum: The same law, which was given through Moses, became grace and truth through Jesus Christ, since the Spirit was added to the letter, that the justice of the law might begin to be fulfilled, which not being fulfilled made men guilty because of their transgression.* But that Paul by the word "letter" was referring to the law, can be understood from the words following. For, when he said: *Our sufficiency is from God, who has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit; for the written code kills, but the Spirit gives life.* And adds immediately: *Now if the dispensation of death carved in letters on stone, came with such splendor that the Israelites could not look at Moses face because of its brightness, fading as this was, will not the dispensation of the Spirit be attended with greater splendor?* With these words he left no room for doubt but that by the letter that kills, which was carved in stone, he is speaking about the law.

But it will be helpful to explain briefly, regarding the Law given through Moses, why it is said to be the letter, why killing, why proper to the old covenant. We will do this lest, while we refute the Libertines and Shwenkfeldians, we may seem to concede something to the Lutherans.

The first doubt will be easy and almost nothing, if we compare Moses with ChrisL and the law with grace. For, when Moses delivered to the people the law given by God, he gave them nothing but words carved in stone; but Christ did not write down any words, nor did he bring words written by someone else, but he brought the Spirit of love and grace, which cannot be written down, and he breathed it into the hearts of his own. Therefore, rightly the law of Christ has been called spirit and grace, while the law of

Moses is called the letter.

But opinions vary on why the law is said to kill. Origen in book 6 of his *Contra Celsum,* towards the end, says that the killing letter seems to mean that it is Scripture itself, when it is explained according to the proper meaning of the words; but the same is a vivifying spirit, if it is understood mystically and spiritually: *He calls it the letter,* Origen said, *'when we take the divine letters according to the sense, but the spirit when taken according to the understanding.* And he is clearer in about the middle of book 7: *We say that the law is twofold, that is, one according to the letter, the other according to its meaning, as our ancestors taught. It is not so much we, but God, through a prophet, who calls the letter of the law, which is accepted just as it was written, a bad law and bad precepts. Concerning this, our Paul said that the letter kills, which is as if he had said that words kill. Moreover, the Spirit, he said, gives life, which has just so much value as if he had written that we will obtain life by understanding them.* That is what Origen said. If his opinion is accepted in such a way that absolutely nothing in the divine scriptures can be explained literally, it contains a certain error, and now for a long time it has been rejected by the Fathers. See the letter of Epiphanius to John and against the heresy of Origen; Chrysostom in Homily 13 on Genesis; Jerome in his letter to Pammachius, concerning the errors of John of Jerusalem, and in chapter 10 of his commentary on Daniel; Augustine in book 13, chapter 21, of *The City of God,* and in book 8, chapter 1, in his commentary on Genesis. But if these things are all said figuratively, then they cannot be explained according to the proper signification of the words; this indeed is an opinion, but in no way does it agree with this passage in St. Paul. For the Apostle, when he says that the letter kills, is not speaking about the figures of Scripture, but about those well-known precepts, which were written on the two stone tablets. For what he says is this: *The written letter kills, but the Spirit gives life. Now if the dispensation of death, carved in letters on stone, came with such splendor, etc.* And again in his letter to the Romans, where he repeats several times that the law kills, he is not referring to any other law but this: Thou shalt not covet. *And so* (to use the words of Augustine in his book on the spirit and the letter, chapter 4) *something is not being said figuratively, which cannot be understood according to the literal meaning of the words, when it says: Thou shalt not covet; for, that is a clear and wholesome precept: if a person follows that, he will not have any sin.*

Indeed St. John Chrysostom in commenting on 2 Cor. 3:7ff. and those who follow him; Theodoretus and the commentary which is attributed to St. Ambrose, and some others teach that the killing letter is the punishing law, and that the vivifying Spirit is grace freeing us from sin. For, the law not only commanded that adulterers and thieves be killed, but also anyone who gathered sticks on the Sabbath (see Num. 15:32-36). But grace absolves even veiy wicked men, and those guilty of eveiy kind of offense, by the washing of regeneration or by the word of reconciliation.

However, this explanation is not altogether satisfactory; for the divine law, just as it decrees punishments for the wicked, so also it establishes rewards for the good. And just as it is written in Deut. 27:26:: *Cursed be he who does not confirm the words of this law by doing them;* so also it is written in Lev. 18:26: *You shall therefore keep my*

statutes and my ordinances, by doing which a man shall live. Why therefore is the law said to kill, but not also to give life? For, if the letter rightly can be said to kill, which kills its transgressors, for the same reason the letter can be said to give life, because it communicates life to those who keep it.

Therefore, the opinion of St. Augustine is true and very much in harmony with the words of St. Paul, namely, that the law without grace was called a killing letter by St. Paul for two reasons. First, since it could not be fulfilled, because in a certain way it makes the one to whom it is given a transgressor. The same Apostle says in Rom. 4:15: *For the law brings wrath, but where there is no law there is no transgression.* Then, that increases concupiscence by reason of the prohibition; for, very correctly he says: We always put our trust in what is forbidden, and we desire what is denied to us. And the Apostle says: *But sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, wrought in me all kinds of covetousness* (see Rom. 7:8), and St. Augustine in chapter 4 of his work on the spirit and the letter says: *That doctrine which commands "thou shalt not covet," is good and praiseworthy; but where the Holy Spirit does not help by inspiring good concupiscence for bad concupiscence, that is, diffusing charity in our hearts; indeed that law, although good, by forbidding things increases bad desires; like the force of water, if in some part it does not cease to flow, it becomes more vehement against an opposing obstacle; and when it has overcome it, it rolls on more violently and with greater force. And this is how sin deceives through a command, and because of it kills, since a transgression now takes place, which did not exist when there was no law.*

Wherefore neither per se, nor from its own wickedness, but only from opportunity, when it is accepted but not when it is just given, the law kills. For, as the Apostle says in Rom. 7:11: *Sin, finding opportunity in the commandment, deceived me and by it killed me. So the law is holy, and the commandment is holy and just and good. Did that which is good, then, bring death to me? By no means! It was sin, working death in me through what is good.*

Finally, the question remains: why the law, or the letter is said to be proper to the old covenant. For, in the Old Testament the law did not thrive without grace, or the letter without the Spirit, since during that time there were so many justified and blameless men, as St. Luke says in chapter 1 about Zechariah and Elizabeth: *Both were righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blameless.* And in the New Testament the Spirit does not reign without the letter, or grace without the law, since Christ said in Matt. 5:21-22: *You have heard that it was said to the men of old, 'You shall not kill; and whoever kills shall be liable to judgment.' But I say to you that every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to the council,* and so forth. And again in John 3:5: *Unless one is born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God;* and in Matt. 28:19: *Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you.*

What is ίζ therefore, that the Apostle says in 2 Cor. 3:6: *God has qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit?* For what reason does he exclude the letter, that is, the law from the New Testament, in which we see that so

many laws are prescribed by Christ himself? But that question is easy to answer, if we discern something per se concerning the purpose of both testaments, and that pertains properly to both testaments. The real purpose of the Old Testament was to bring it about that the human race would be warned about its sickness and wounds in its first parent, as corrupted and vitiated in its origin, and so, having been moved with fear and sorrow, to seek a cure. The law leads them to this end. The Apostle says in Rom. 3:20: *Through the law comes knowledge of sin;* and again: *If it had not been for the law, I should not have known sin.* And the great Augustine said in letter 200 to Asellicus: *The advantage of the law is that it convinces a man concerning his own infirmity, and it forces him to beg for the medicine of grace, which is in Christ.*

Wherefore per se and properly the Old Testament, which is contained in laws and letters, produces fear and generates servitude, as Paul says in Rom. 8 and Gal. 4. But those who are said to have been just and free under the Old Testament were such not by the letter of the Old Testament but by the Spirit of the New Testament. St. Augustine says in letter 120 to Honoratus: *Those saints lived under the Old Testament according to the proportion of the time, but they pertained to the New Testament.* And in book 1, chapter 11 in his treatise on merit and the forgiveness of sins he says: *Grace alone of the Savior destroys the reign of death in each man; this also was done in the ancient saints, that is, in those before Christ came in the flesh, but they pertained to his helping grace, not to the letter of the law, which only commanded but could not help.* But the purpose of the New Testament is nothing other than to heal, to cure, to liberate. Grace indeed does all of that. St. Paul says in Rom. 7:24-25: *Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? The grace of God through Jesus Christ our Lord.* And St. Augustine said in chapter 30 in his book on the Spirit and the letter: *Through the law came the knowledge of sin, but through grace the healing of the soul from the evil of sin.*

Therefore, the New Testament per se and properly does not bring the law, but grace, and it is not the ministry of the letter but only of the Spirit; it is nothing other than the love of God poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit who has been given to us, which the prophet foretold long ago, when Jeremiah said (chapter 31:31-33): *Behold, the days are coming, says the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah, not like the covenant I made with their fathers when I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt, my covenant which they broke, though I was their husband, says the Lord. But this is the covenant which I will make with the house of Israel after those days, says the Lord: I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts.* Therefore, if this has to do with what per se and properly belongs to both testaments, Paul said very truly in 2 Cor. *3:6: God qualified us to be ministers of a new covenant, not in a written code but in the Spirit.* In the same vein St. John says in chapter 1:17: *The law was given through Moses; grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.*

But although the New Testament per se and properly does not impose new laws, still it does include laws for two reasons. First, because the grace of the New Testament does not destroy all the laws, which are necessary to live well and happily, and actually it affirms them. This is because it provides the powers to human weakness in order to keep

them. Thus the Apostle said in Rom. 3:31: *Do we then overthrow the law by thisfaith? By no means! On the contrary, we uphold the law.* And after that in 8:3: *For God has done what the law, weakened by theflesh, could not do: sending his own Son in the likeness of sinfulflesh andfor sin, he condemned sin in theflesh, in order that thejust requirement ofthe law might befulfilled in us.* And St. Augustine in chapter 19 in his book on the Spirit and the letter said: *Therefore the law was given that grace might be sought, grace was given that the law might befulfilled. For the law was notfulfilled because ofits own fault, but by thefault ofthe prudence oftheflesh. Thatfault was made manifest by the law and it was cured by grace.*

Then Christ also brought some new laws, like baptism, the Eucharist, the sacraments, either to be dispensed or to be received; because, although Christ did not come to us so that like a new Moses he might oppress us under the weight of the law, he did come to rescue us with the help of his grace from the heavy weight of the law. Nevertheless he thought that wholesome laws should be added to the old precepts of morals, which, while they lead us to the sacraments and through the sacraments to grace, not only do not oppress with the burden of a heavy weight, but also bear us aloft like wings, as St. Augustine says in his book on perfect justice. Now enough has been said about the first objection.

Other objections, because they are common to the Shwenkfeldians and Libertines, along with Lutherans and Calvinists, will be answered more appropriately in the disputation in which, with the help of God, we will consider the interpretation of the Scriptures and the judgment of the controversies.

CHAPTER IV

WHICH BOOKS ARE SACRED?

By the argumentation above it has been proved sufficiently, in my opinion, that the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures are sacred and inspired by God. The next point to prove is which books are truly prophetic and apostolic. This question about the number of the sacred books is divided into three parts. First of all it is necessary to consider those books about whose authority there has never been any debate among Catholics. Next we will treat the books which, although they are truly prophetic or apostolic, still their authority has not always been certain and established. Finally, we will treat those books which, although they were placed at one time in the number of the divine volumes by some famous and learned men, still have never been approved by the official judgment of the whole Church.

Here are the names of the books of the first order: the Pentateuch of Moses, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, the four books of Kings, two books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Job, 150 Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Canticle of Canticles, the four major prophets, the twelve minor prophets, the four Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, thirteen letters of Paul, omitting only the letter to the Hebrews, the two canonical epistles, one letter of Peter, one letter of John.

The second order contains these books: Esther, Baruch, part of Daniel, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, the two books of Maccabees, certain parts of Mark, Luke and John, the Letter to the Hebrews, the Letter of James, 2 Peter, a small part of 1 John, 2 and 3 John, Jude, Apocalypse.

The third order contains all those which are mentioned by Innocent in his 3rd letter to Exuperius, by Gelasius in distinction 15, by Athanasius in his synopsis, by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 25 of his history. From these testimonies we have the following: the prayer of Manasses III and IV, Ezra III, 4 Maccabees, Psalm 151, appendix to the book of Job, the book of the Shepherd Hermas. All the Supreme Pontiffs, all the councils, all the Fathers, who for any reason took pains to list the books, in the Catholic Church have always attributed divine authority to the books of the first order. Of the Pontiffs, consult Innocent I in his letter 3 to Exuperius, Gelasius I in his decree on the sacred books, which is found in the second volume of the councils. Of the councils, see Laodicea canon 59, Carthage III canon 47, Florence in its Decree for the Armenians, Trent in session 4.

From the Greek Fathers, see Origen in Eusebius, book 6, chapter 18 of his history. And Eusebius himself in book 3, chapter 25 of the history; Athanasius in the synopsis, Gregory Nazianzen in his book on the genuine scriptures, Epiphanius in the book on measures and weights. See also re the heresy of the Anhomoians, Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechism (# 4). Finally, John Damascene in book 4, chapter 18 of his treatise on faith.

From the Latin Fathers, see Jerome in his letter to Paulinus about the study of the sacred Scriptures, Rufinus in his explanation of the Creed, Augustine in book 2, chapter

8 in his work on Christian doctrine, Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of the etymologies. Add to these three other authors, who list only the books of the Old Testament: Josephus in book 1 against Apion, Melito of Sarda in book 4, chapter 26 of Eusebius's history, and Hilary in his preface to the Psalms.

Moreover, other Fathers like Justin, Irenaeus, Basil, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, and all the rest, both Greek and Latin, although they do not describe the series of divine books, nevertheless passim they make use of their testimonies, so that they have bom witness clearly that they consider all of them to be among the sacred books.

CHAPTER V

ON HERETICS WHO HAVE ATTACKED BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT OF THE FIRST ORDER

Although in the Catholic Church, with a consensus of all the orthodox, the authority of the listed books has always been maintained, still heretics were not lacking, who strove to remove absolutely all authority from them. But since by the diligence of our ancestors these heresies were extinguished and buried a long time ago, once again in our century Pope Sixtus of Siena in his last collection of books treated them in his own style and now I will try to dispose of them as briefly as possible. Therefore, at different times there have been eighteen heresies against those books, which we listed as being of the first order.

The first is that of those who reject all the books of the Old Testament, because they think they were dictated by some evil god. First, the Simonians, Basilidians and Marcionists were of that opinion (see Irenaeus, book 4, chapters 20, 22, 29); then the Manicheans, which is found in Epiphanius on the heresies (# 66); the Bogomiles in Eutymius Panopliae part 2, title 23, chapter 1; the Albigensians in Antoninus part 4, title 11, chapter 7. Also there were fifteen Anabaptists preaching in Frankental: they said that the Old Testament should be admitted in disputes about the faith only inasmuch as it agrees with the New Testament.

Epiphanius refutes this heresy as the heresy of the Manicheans, and Augustine does the same in his book against Faustus the Manichean and in two other books against the adversaries of the law and the prophets; then there was also Peter of Cluny in his letter against the Petrobrusians.

And surely it seems to be amazing that the heretics, who venerated the books of the New Testament, could contemn the books of the Old Testament, since the latter have many clear testimonies of their authority from the former. For, the Lord says in Luke 24:44 *Everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled.* And the Apostle said in Rom. 1:1: *Paul, an apostle, set apart for the gospel of God which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures.* And again in Gal. 4:22: *It is written that Abraham had two sons, one by a slave and one by a free woman... Now this is an allegory: these women are two covenants.* Likewise elsewhere in Heb. 1:1 : *In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son....*

There was another heresy of a certain Ptolemy. He (as Epiphanius recounts in Heresies 33) divided the law of Moses into three parts; and of one part he made the author the maker of the world, of the second Moses, of the third the elders of the synagogue. But the true God for Ptolemy was not the maker of the world, but only a certain a deity between God and the devil. Therefore, he thought not only that the universal law is not sacred and divine, but not even any part of it.

Zechariah in Luke 1:70 refutes this heresy when he says that the Lord God of Israel has spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets, who are from of old. The Apostle Paul disproves the same heresy, since he says in 2 Tim. 3:16 that all Scripture is

divinely inspired.

The third heresy is that of Theodore of Mopsuestia, a bishop, who rejects all the prophets, not indeed openly, but when he imprudently says that they never said anything about Christ (as can be understood from the fragments of his comments, which are recounted in the fifth synod), both when he diminishes too much the utility and authority of the prophets themselves, and makes Christ himself and the Apostles guilty of blatant lies. For, what else will it be but a lie, concerning what the truth itself says of himself, when Luke in chapter 4:21 quotes the perfect testimony of Isaiah: *Today this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing?* What else will it be but a lie, concerning what Peter says in Acts 10:43: *To him all the prophets bear witness?*

I am omitting other testimonies of the prophets which are used passim in the New Testament about Christ by the evangelists and Apostles. For, there are so many of them that they cannot be enumerated briefly. See, for example, Matt. 1,2,4, 12,21, 27; Mark 12,15; Luke 11; John 2,12,19; Acts 2,4,13; Eph. 4; Heb. 1,10, etc.

The fourth heresy rejects the Psalms of David as human, or rather profane songs, written without any divine inspiration. Philastrius makes the Nicolaitans and Gnostics the authors of this heresy in his catalogue of heretics (chapter 127). Paul of Samosate put in writing (Eusebius, History, book 7, chapter 25) that those Psalms, which were sung to Christ, were composed recently and approved by the Church.

But perhaps that Paul removed from his Church not so much the Psalms of David, but certain ecclesiastical hymns. For it is not credible that the Psalms of David could seem to the bishop of Samosate to be recently composed. Surely they refute this absurdity with clear words—David himself, and also Christ and the Apostles, since the author of 2 Sam. 23:1-2 says: *Now these are the last words of David: The oracle of David, the son of Jesse,., the anointed of the God of Jacob, the sweet psalmist of Israel: The Spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my tongue.* And the Lord says in Matt. 22:43-44: *How is it then that David, inspired by the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying: The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand?* These words are read in Psalm 110. And all the Apostles with one voice say: *Sovereign Lord, who by the mouth of our father David, thy servant, didst say by the Holy Spirit: Why did the Gentiles rage* (Ps. 2:1). Finally, the Apostle Paul in Heb. 3:15 said: *As the Holy Spirit says: Today, when you hear his voice...* which are the words of Psalm 94.

The fifth heresy is that of the Hebrews, who in the Talmud ord. 4 tract. 3, do not place the book of Job among the divine books, and think that Job himself never lived among men. Some later Rabbis, like R. Salomon, R. Levi ben Gerson, and several others, seem indeed to accept the book, since they tried to explain it with commentaries; but they reprehend Job not just once nor lightly. Since R. Salomon rashly says that holy Job, being impatient because of the calamity that befell him, sinned not in his words but in his heart. And Rabbi Levi, going further, writes: this blessed man, having denied divine providence and the resurrection of the dead, received just punishments.

Martin Luther also in his table conversations concerning the patriarchs and prophets says that he does not believe that everything was done as it is narrated in the book of Job. And again, in his book on the Old and New Testaments he says: the book of Job is like

the argument of a fable in order to give an example of patience.

But certainly Ezekiel can be a reliable witness against the Hebrews that the history of Job is not fiction, and that Job himself was truly a holy and perfect man. For, Ezekiel says in chapter 14:14 *Even if these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, they would deliver but their own lives by their righteousness.* And for now we will omit what Tobias in chapter 2 and James in chapter 5 write: we also omit what the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 3 when he quotes Job 5 as being from the divine scripture. However, the Talmudists do not accept the testimonies of these books.

The sixth heresy is that of those who repudiate the book of Solomon, which is called Ecclesiastes; the evidence for this is found in Philastrius in his catalogue of heresies, chapter 132, and in Jacob Christopolitanus in the preface of his commentaries on the Canticle of Canticles; Solomon seems to have composed this book in his old age, when being deprived of the love of women, he placed the greatest good in bodily pleasures and so prepared the way for the philosophy of Epicurus and Aristippus.

Martin Luther in his table conversations, contained in his book on the Old and New Testaments, says that the author of the book, which is called Ecclesiastes, seems to him to be lacking in greaves and spurs, and is riding his horse with slippers alone, as he was wont to do when he was still a monk.

But it is so far from the truth that the Ecclesiastes of Solomon is speaking about pleasure, that rather he is exhorting with grave words all men to despise human things and to fear God, like a firm and severe teacher of morals. What is the nature of its beginning? *Vanity of vanities, says the Preacher, vanity of vanities! All is vanity* (Eccles. 1:2). How does it end? *The end of the matter; all has been heard. Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man* (Eccles. 12:13). He says in chapter 2:2: *I said of laughter: "It is mad," and of pleasure, "What use is it?"* And in chapter 3:17 *I said in my heart, God will judge the righteous and the wicked.* And in chapter 5:1ff.: *Guard your steps when you go to the house of God; to obey is better than to offer the sacrifice of fools... Be not rash with your mouth, nor let your heart be hasty to utter a word before God.* And in chapter 7:2: *It is better to go to the house of mourning than to go to the house feasting.* And in chapter 8:11: *Because sentence against an evil deed is not executed speedily, the heart of the sons of men is fully set to do evil.* And in chapter 9:16: *Wisdom is better than weapons of war, but on sinner destroys much good.* And in chapter 10:16: *Woe to you, O land, when your king is the son of free men, and your princes feast at the proper time, for strength and not for drunkenness.* And finally in chapter 11:9: *Know that for all these things God will bring you into judgment. Remove vexation from your mind, and put away pain from your body; for youth and the dawn of life are vanity.* Do these things sound like Aristippus? Have such severe precepts ever come out of the workshop of Epicurus?

But if Ecclesiastes sometimes prescribes that the that the pleasure of eating and drinking is not to be spumed, he does not do it because he judges every pleasure positively, but in order to reproach certain greedy and unclean men, who choose to deprive themselves of necessary and licit conveniences and delights rather than spend even a small amount of their accumulated money.

Also there are not a few things, which are said in this book, that are not from the judgment of Solomon, but from the opinion of vulgar people and of stupid and voluptuous men. St. Gregory the Great demonstrates this point elegantly and at length in his Dialogues (book 4, chapter 4).

It is not true what is affirmed by the heretics, namely, that this book was written during the time in which Solomon was corrupted by the love of women; this can be proved by four reasons. For, in the first place, in 1 Kings chapters 4 and 11 and in the book which is called Ecclesiasticus (chapter 47), since the deeds of Solomon are reported in an orderly manner, his writings are mentioned before his loves.

Then, in this very book which we are considering, Ecclesiastes constantly affirms his wisdom, that is, what he formerly received as a divine gift to remain with him for his lifetime: for, he says in chapter 2:3: *Also my wisdom remained with me.* It is not probable that the light of heavenly wisdom could dwell at the same time with that corruption of the heart, about Scripture speaks, when he says in 1 Kings 11:4: *And his wives turned away his heart. For when Solomon was old his wives turned away his heart after other gods.*

Next, in the second chapter of this book Solomon enumerates all his delights—palaces, pools, fruit trees, female slaves, singers, silver and gold vases, and many other things of that kind; and he had so many concubines and wives, because of which he easily contemned all other delights, and they alone were able to soften and corrupt his heart, lest he remember who he was. Therefore he had not begun to love at the time when he wrote this book.

Finally, who could believe that such serious thoughts, which we have just quoted, could possibly come from a mind so soft and so effeminate as that of Solomon, since he had seven hundred wives and three hundred concubines to satisfy his lust?

I am fully aware that the opinion of the old Jews, according to the testimony of St. Jerome in his commentary on Eccles. 1, was that this book was composed by Solomon after he had done penance for his sins. And Jerome seems to approve this opinion in his commentary on Ezekiel 43, but I have always thought that the opinion of St. Augustine is more probable; for, he writes in his commentary on Ps. 126, and often elsewhere, that Solomon was rejected by God, because Scripture strongly reprimands his old age, and it never adds anything about his penance. But if someone prefers to follow the first opinion, I have no objection, since both opinions serve to support our position. But that is enough for now about Ecclesiastes.

The seventh heresy is not unlike the previous one, as Philastrius in chapter 133 and Jacob Christopolitanus in the place already noted have written; among the ancient heretics there were not lacking those who thought that the Canticle of Canticles was written not by the Spirit of the true God, but by an inspiration of cupidity, and that nothing else is contained in that Canticle but the amorous words of King Solomon and of his wife, the daughter of the Pharaoh. Therefore they considered the Canticle to be profane, and for that reason that the name of God is not found in the whole book; Beza, in his preface to Joshua, attributed this same point to Castalionus.

But if the spouse who is so greatly praised in these songs were the daughter of the Pharaoh, that is, of a powerful king, how many things were said ineptly by a very

wise man? Can this in Cant. 1:6 be applied to the daughter of a king: *My mother's sons were angry with me, they made me keeper of the vineyards?* Or also this in the same place: *Follow in the tracks of the flock, and pasture your kids?* And what about this in chapter 5::7: *The watchmen found me, as they went about in the city, they beat me, they wounded me?* Also this in chapter 8:1 : *O that you were like a brother to me, that nursed at my mother's breast! If I met you outside, I would kiss you?* Who could believe that the daughter of the king of Egypt was either a rustic woman or the sister of Solomon, or could be wounded by the watchmen on the walls?

But the same woman, who in one place is described as rustic, in another place is called the daughter of a prince. Thus in chapter 7:1: *How graceful are your feet in sandals, O daughter of a king.* And again, the one who in chapter 5 is said to be wounded by the watchmen on the wall, the same in chapter 6 is introduced as terrible as an army in battle array. Actually this is the prudence of the Holy Spirit, so that God may explain his benevolence towards the human race, and how with burning charity through the mysteiy of the Incarnation Christ has joined the Church to himself, as his bride, and he wanted his nuptial song to be sung a long time before that.

But so that no occasion might be given of suspecting, either that the daughter of the Pharaoh or some other woman was being praised by that song, Christ wanted those things to be written about his own spouse, which could not be applied to any individual woman.

Also for this reason we believe it was done so that, since the appearance of the spouse is commended, and depicted as it were with her colors, those things are said which most fittingly pertain to the Church, but can dishonor a woman rather than honor her. For, what kind of beauty would it be of a woman, whose head was enormous like Carmel, nose like a tower, eyes like pools, teeth like flocks of shorn sheep, but she herself totally black like the tents of Kedar?

It is not surprising that of the ten names of God, which occur passim in the divine books of the Old Testament, and which are explained briefly in letter 136 of St. Jerome to Marcellus, not one of them occurs in this spiritual epithalamium. Since in the other books of the Old Testament God, in his dealings with the synagogue, that is, with his handmaid, again and again calls himself God, Lord, strong, omnipotent; but in the Canticles of love, where the Son of God speaks with the Church, that is, the bridegroom with his spouse, rightly those names are omitted which were suited to inculcate terror. And here he calls himself only spouse, father, friend, loving and loved; these names pertain to fostering and stirring up love.

The eighth heresy is that of Porphyry, and St. Jerome writes about it in the following way in the preface of his commentary on Daniel: *Porphyry wrote his twelfth book against Daniel, denying that it was written by the one whose name is on it, but by another man who, at the time when Antiochus, who is called Epiphanes, was in Judea; and he said thaï Daniel did not speak about the future, but narrated things of the past. Finally, whatever he said took place before Antiochus was true history; but if he opined anything further, because he did not know the future, it was a lie.*

Nie can omit here from the book of Daniel the divine testimony of Christ, mentionec in Matt. 24, which is not admitted by Porphyry. But Josephus writes in book 11, chapter

8 of his antiquities that the book of Daniel was offered by the priests to Alexander the Great when he came to Jerusalem; and when the passage in chapter 8 was shown to him, where the ram would by conquered and overthrown by the goat, that is, the king of the Persians by the king of the Greeks, Daniel both predicted that and explained it. Now since Alexander preceded Antiochus by more than 150 years, by what kind of reasoning could it happen that this book was written during the time of Antiochus—a book which had been shown to Alexander so many years before? But the prophecies in Daniel that were fulfilled after the time of Antiochus were not lies, as Porphyry would have it, but true prophecies; and he surely will understand this who carefully studies those books, which St. Jerome, in his preface to his commentary on Daniel, says should be read.

CHAPTER VI

ON THE HERETICS WHO HAVE ATTACKED THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CITED ABOVE

The ninth heresy repudiates in general the books of the gospels. The authors of this error are divided into two camps. For there are some in this heresy who think that gospels were written neither by the Apostles nor by other disciples of the Lord, but by some imposters, who mixed together many false things with what is true, and still tried to sell their own comments as apostolic writings. St. Augustine says that Faustus, the Manichean, thought this and wrote about it (see Contra Faustum, book 32, ch. 2 and book 33, ch. 3). Others, however, did not deny that the gospels were written by the Apostles, but said that in many places they contradict themselves or are opposed to the truth; and therefore that the Apostles partly err, as men sometimes do, and partly did not hesitate to enhance the glory of their teacher with contradictory narrations.

And this opinion has had many supporters. First the Gentiles, according to St. Augustine, in chapter 16 of his retraction, then Julian the Apostate, according to Cyril in book 10; then Mohammed, the pseudo-prophet, according to John Damascene in his book on the heresies; finally, Othones Brunfelsius, according to the testimony of Cochlaeus in his book on the authority of Scripture and the Church, chapters 3 and 4.

St. Augustine refutes the first heresy, which is that of the Manicheans, for two reasons in his book against Faustus (book 32, chapter 16 and 24, and in book 33, chapter 7). First, because the Manicheans, when they tty to confirm their errors by quoting the gospels, and nevertheless contend that the same gospels were written by some imposters, thus surely seem to act as if someone would first say that his witness has been corrupted with falsehood, and then finally produces him for his testimony.

Secondly, since if from the clear and continuous evidence of so many centuries one after another, it is not sufficiently proved that they are the writings of the Apostles, which bear the names of the Apostles, and the Church holds that they are from the Apostles themselves, and they have been diffused among the nations far and wide: then faith is destroyed in the authenticity of all writings and books. If indeed this applies to the books of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Varro, and other such authors, how is it established that the books are theirs? Hence, if someone denies this, he is not refuted but only laughed at; because a series of events commended them from their own time until our time, it is clear that only one who is demented could have doubts about the authenticity of these books.

In the next place, the same Augustine no less briefly and keenly refutes another heresy with these arguments in book 1, chapters 7 and 8 in his book on the harmony of the gospels. First, if we believe their disciples who wrote about Pythagoras and Socrates, who themselves did not write anything; what reason is there why we should not put faith in the Apostles who wrote about their Master? Or is it perhaps the case, since they were wise, that they could have truthful disciples, but Christ who, also with their consent, endowed all of them with wisdom, could not produce truthful disciples?

Then because they themselves, who say that the Apostles wrote false things, thinl·

that Christ was the most wise man, and they could not learn that from any other source except from the writings of the Apostles, are they not sufficiently convinced that at one time to believe and at another time not to believe in the books of the Apostles is prompted not by a reasonable judgment but by an act of the will? Furthermore, if his disciples very passionately wanted to magnify the glory of the Master, they would certainly, regarding the ignominy of the cross, either have had to remain silent about it or to treat it as briefly as possible; but in order to explain his return from the underworld and his Ascension into heaven they would treat it at great length. So why did all the evangelists hardly mention the Resurrection and the Ascension? And in explaining the chains, the scourging, the cross, the insults, the dishonor, the torments—why did they treat them at such length? Clearly they did this not to promote the praise of the Master with a false narration, but because they intended to present the words of Christ and the things done by him simply and with a true account.

The tenth heresy accepts three evangelists—Matthew, Mark and Luke—in order to reject John as contraiy to them. Philastrius in chapter 60 mentions this heresy without giving the name of the author, but Epiphanius (Heresies 51) thinks that it could come from the Alogorians and St. Augustine agrees with him about this (Heresies 30).

The eleventh heresy approves only the gospel of Matthew; Irenaeus in book 1, chapter 26, says that the author of this heresy was Ebion. See also on this point Epiphanius (Heresies 30) and Eusebius in book 3, ch. 21 of his history.

The twelfth heresy, which is that of Cherinthus, by the same testimony of Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 11, uses only the gospel of Mark.

The thirteenth heresy is that of Marcion, as Irenaeus in the same place, and Tertullian in his book of prescription against heretics wrote down, namely, that he accepted only the gospel of Luke, although not all of it, since he said it was mutilated and corrupted, as is clear from Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion, and from Epiphanius in Heretics 42.

The fourteenth heresy acknowledges no gospel except that of John. Irenaeus in the same place makes Valentinus the author of this heresy. And Martin Luther seems to have desired strongly that this heresy should grow strong and flourish, although, since he understood that the matter at this time was too difficult, he thought that not too much effort should be put into it. Certainly in his preface to the New Testament, as John Cochlaeus also mentioned in his book on the authority of Scripture and of the Church (chapter 3) and in Septicipite (chapter 5), Luther said that the false opinion that there are only four gospels should be abandoned. He also said that the gospel of John is the unique, beautiful, true and principal gospel, and that it is to be preferred by far to the other three gospels, so that even the epistles of Paul and Peter take precedence over the gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke.

In order to refute these last five heresies the ancient Fathers attempted to demonstrate with many reasons not only that there are only four gospels, but also that neither more nor fewer ought to have been composed. See Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 11, Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion, Ambrose in the preface to his commentary, and book 10, chapter 101; Eucharius in book 1, chapter 14 on Genesis, Jerome in the preface to his commentary on Matthew, Augustine in book 1, chapter 6 in his harmony of the gospels,

and Gregory in his homily 4 on Ezekiel. And surely, as we omit some other reasons, what must we believe is the meaning of those four animals, which have been divinely described by Ezekiel and John—man, lion, bull, eagle, except that they are the four evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke and John? For the people everywhere bear witness to this not only in writing and with their voices, but the walls themselves proclaim it with signs and images.

The fifteenth heresy removes the book of the Acts of the Apostles from the number of the divine books. There are many authors of this heresy: Cherinthus in Philastrius (chapter 16), Cerdones in Tertullian's book on prescription, Tatian in book 4, chapter 29 of Eusebius's history, the Manicheans in Augustine's book on the advantage of believing (chapter 3).

The sixteenth heresy is that of the Ebionites, who reject all the writings of the Apostle Paul, and they call Paul himself a Greek and an apostate. Witnesses for this are Irenaeus in book 1, chapter 26, and Epiphanius in heresies (chapter 30). Eusebius writes that afterwards the same error was adopted by the Helcheseitists (Ecclesiastical History, book 6, chapter 27).

The seventeenth heresy, which is that of Marcion, according to Epiphanius in heresies 42, and Jerome in the preface to his commentary on Paul's letter to Titus, who rejected all the letters to Timothy and Titus; from the other letters, he cuts out with his knife whatever displeases him. Peter, the abbot of Cluny, accurately refutes these three heresies in his first epistle against the Henricians and Petrobrusians; and it is not worth the trouble to spend more time on such an obvious matter.

The last heresy is that of those who, in the letters themselves of St. Paul, and in other sacred and divine books, say that not all of them were written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, but that they were directed sometimes by prudence and human reason alone. Wherefore they made little of the letter to Philemon by saying it was written in a human way. Those who formerly fell into this error were both the Anomoeans as found in Epiphanius (heresies 76), and also some others as found in Jerome in his chapter 5 on Micah, and in the preface to his commentaiy on the letter to Philemon; it also found in Augustine in book 2, chapter 2, of his treatise against the adversary of the law and the prophets.

In our century Erasmus renewed this same heresy; since in his annotations to chapters 2 and 27 of Matthew he did not write in an obscure manner that there is no reason to fear lest the authority of all the Scriptures be corrupted, if some small error is found in them, especially since Augustine concedes that sometimes the evangelists suffered from a lapse of memory (in book 3, chapter 7 of his harmony of the gospels), and it seems possible that it can in no way be denied.

This heresy was refuted by Epiphanius, Jerome and Augustine in the places just noted above. But because Erasmus misuses the testimony of St. Augustine, it will be worth our trouble to examine the words of this one scholar. Therefore, Augustine speaks in the following way in book 2, chapter 12, of his treatise on the harmony of the gospels: *It is fitting that every falsity be absent from the evangelists, not only that which is the result of lying, but also that which comes from forgetting.* Therefore Augustine does not, as Erasmus says, attribute to the evangelists any error coming from a lapse of memory.

Again, in letter 8 to St. Jerome he said: *For if once a direct lie is admitted in a book of such elevated authority, no part of those books will remain which will not seem to everyone to be, either difficult for morals, or incredible for faith, and so the same dangerous rule will be applied to the deliberation and allegation of a lying author.* This reason of Augustine is very convincing, for if some error in Scripture could be committed by the author either by inexperience, or by forgetfulness, or by any other human weakness, then whatever text is cited, a question could be raised about it whether in writing it the author had fallen asleep.

What, therefore, you may ask, did Augustine mean when, in the third book of his treatise on the harmony of the gospels (chapter 7) concerning the place in Matthew where Jeremiah is read for Zechariah, he attributes this error of the correct name to a lapse of memory? I respond that I have not read in Augustine an error, or a lapse of memory, as Erasmus says, but that the mind of the evangelist was miraculously guided by the Holy Spirit to be without error and with such a lapse. Augustine says this one thing: that it happened by divine providence that the evangelist wrote the name of one prophet for another: in this case, if there was a lapse or an error, certainly it was of the Holy Spirit. But no one of a sane mind has ever said that the Holy Spirit could forget or err. But let us hear the words themselves of St. Augustine.

He said: *What is to be understood here except that it is from the secret counsel of the providence of God by which the minds of the evangelists were governed? For it could have happened that it occurred to the mind of Matthew, when he was writing his gospel, to say Jeremiah in place of Zechariah, as is wont to happen, which however without any hesitation he would correct, at least after having been admonished by others who could read this while he was still living, unless he recalled to his memory, which was ruled by the Holy Spirit, that one name for the other had not occurred to him in vain, because the Lord had determined that this should be so written. But why the Lord so decreed, the first useful reason must very easily be thought, and also to be in such a way suggested, that it is certain that all the holy prophets spoke with one Spirit with a wonderful agreement among themselves, so that this might be much more comprehensive, as if everything from the prophets were said by one mouth of one prophet, and therefore doubtless whatever the Holy Spirit said through them must be accepted, both the individual statements of all, and all the statements of each one. Therefore since things said by Jeremiah belong both to Zechariah and to Jeremiah; and the things said by Zechariah belong both to Jeremiah and to Zechariah: what need was there for Matthew to change it, when he read over again that one name had been written by him for another name, and so he was following the authority of the Holy Spirit, by which he surely knew better than we do that his mind was being guided; and so did he not leave this written, just as the Lord had established after admonishing him, in order to tell us that there is such agreement of his words among the prophets, so that not absurdly, but very suitably we can attribute also to Jeremiah what we find to have been written by Zechariah?*

The arguments which Melchior Cano cites in favor of this heresy in his book on theological sources (book 2, chapters 16,17,18), and then refutes, I have decided should be omitted by me, both because I could not find them among any of the heretics, and also because they can easily be found in Cano himself.

CHAPTER VII

ON THE BOOK OF ESTHER

Up to this point our concern has been with the first order of the sacred books. Now we will consider separately the books of the second order, concerning which there is a greater difficulty. And first of all there is the book of Esther; three important authors have placed this book outside of the canon: Melito Asianus in book 4, chapter 26 of the history of Eusebius, Athanasius in the synopsis, and Gregory Nazianzen in the song he wrote on the genuine scriptures. Also, there were not lacking those who thought that the book of Esther should be numbered among the sacred books, however, the last seven chapters, which are not found in the Hebrew texts, they denied that they were true members of that book, and as an adulteration and foreign matter they thought they should be removed from the rest of the book. We conclude from his preface that St. Jerome was of the same opinion. Those following Jerome before the Council of Trent were Nicholas Lyranus, Dionysius the Carthusian, Cardinals Hugo and Thomas de Vio in their commentaries on this book; after Trent he was followed by Sixtus of Siereena book 1, chapter 8 of his holy library.

But all the decrees of the Pontiffs and Councils certainly prove sufficiently that this book is sacred and divine; and there are also many testimonies of the Hebrew, Greek and Latin Fathers, which we noted above in the fourth chapter of this book. For, if you exclude Melito, Athanasius and Gregory, all the others agree on the divine authority of this book. With regard to what concerns those chapters which are not found in the Hebrew codices, they confirm with the following reasons that they also belong to the sacred canon.

For, first of all, it cannot be denied that the old councils, namely, Laodicea (ch. 59), Carthage III (can. 47), and the ancient Greek Fathers, Origen on the first Psalm, Eusebius in book 3, chapter 27 of his history, Cyril in catechism 4, and Damascene in book 4, chapter 18; also the Latin Fathers, Hilary on the first Psalm, Innocent in his third letter, Rufinus on the creed and Augustine in book 2, chapter 8 in his book on Christian doctrine, when they number the book of Esther among the sacred books, they are speaking about that book which both they themselves and the whole Church were using at that time. But the whole Church at that time used the sacred books according to the edition which St. Jerome, in his preface to the book of Esther and elsewhere, was accustomed to call the Vulgate, which, as he himself says, is contained in the Greek language. Above all, the witnesses are the Greek texts themselves that the seven chapters in the book of Esther in that edition, which we are now considering, were not lacking; that edition was used as the work of the seventy-two interpreters. St. Athanasius is also a witness in the synopsis, where he includes a summaiy and the first sentences of the individual books. Finally, St. Jerome is a witness, because in his translation he says in several places that those seven chapters are lacking in the Hebrew texts, but that they were adopted by him from the Vulgate edition. For this reason, if the councils and Fathers retained the book of Esther, such as they themselves were accustomed to read in the sacred canon, certainly they

retained the whole book with these seven added chapters.

What are we to think, then, since the Fathers not only numbered the book among the sacred books, but also not rarely seek some testimony from those seven last chapters? See Chrysostom in homily 3 to the people of Antioch, and Augustine in letter 199 to Edicia. What are we to think, since Origen in his letter to Julius Africanus demonstrates that this very part of the book of Esther, which is not contained in the volumes of the Hebrews, is sacred and canonical? *In the book of Esther,* he says, *the prayers neither of Mordecai nor of Esther, which can edify the readers, are had among the Hebrews; but neither are the letters, nor what was written by Haman concerning the destruction of the Jewish people, nor that of Mordecai in the name of king Artaxerxes liberating the people from death. But they are present in the Septuagint and in Theodotion.* And after that he writes: *Be careful, therefore, lest while being imprudent and ignorant we abrogate writings which are had passim in the Churches, and lest we establish a law for the brotherhood so that they set aside the sacred books, which are found among them; but they agree with the Hebrews, and they are trying to persuade us that they are giving us something good and that they are not in error. But did not providence in the Holy Scriptures give edification to all the churches of Christ? Did it not take care of those who were bought at a great price, for whom Christ died?*

Finally, in addition there is the decree of the Council of Trent (session 4) in which all the books with all their parts, listed shortly before, are approved, according as they were wont to be read in Church, and are included in the Latin Vulgate edition. The authority of that Council, although it has no value among the heretics, for Sixtus and other Catholics it has the greatest value.

But the Council, said Sixtus in book 1, is speaking about the true parts of the books, not about the additions, like the last chapter of the book of Esther. But if that response of Sixtus were true, many other parts of the sacred books—of Daniel, Mark, Luke, John—would be called into question by Catholics. For, what would Sixtus say, if in order for him to preserve those parts of the divine volumes, the decree of the Council being like a wall to the objector, the adversaries responded that the Council spoke about the true parts, but that those additions were not parts?

Then who could doubt, if certain books have been approved by the Council, that all the true parts of those books have also been approved? Therefore, for what purpose does the Council add those words (i.e., "with all their parts"), unless so that all may understand that also all those parts, concerning which at some time there was a controversy, pertain to the canon of the sacred books?

Finally, the Council of Trent clearly expressed its judgment with the following words, so that there would be absolutely no doubt about this. For, when it said: *If anyone does not accept all these books in their entirety, with all their parts,* the Council added immediately—*as they are being read in the Catholic Church.* But who does not know that, on the fourth ferial day after the second Sunday of Lent, publicly in Church during the solemn ceremonies a reading is sung from the 13th chapter of Esther? And again, that from the same chapter a reading is proclaimed in the Mass that is customarily said against the pagans? And finally that the prayer of Esther is recited from chapter 14 of the same

book on the 22nd Sunday after Pentecost after the singing of the gospel and the Creed? But now it will be worth our while to refute the arguments of the adversaries.

In the first place they say, since the book of Esther was written in Hebrew, that those seven chapters are lacking in the Hebrew doubtless must be thought to be not genuine. To this we respond with Origen in the place quoted above that it is possible that at one time those chapters were included in the Hebrew, and then for some reason were lost. Certainly Josephus in book 11, chapter 6, in his Antiquities, when he narrates the history of Esther, does not omit the two letters of Ahasuerus and the prayer of Mordecai; but since now none of these are found in the Hebrew codices, it is not believable that they were invented by Josephus, since he says the following things about himself in book 10, chapter 12: *In the beginning of my history, because of those who raise questions or try to blame someone, I said that I would translate the Hebrew books into the Greek language; and to open them up to those wanting them, while promising that I would not add anything or omit anything.*

One can also respond that the first author of this book, who undertook to write the history of Esther in Hebrew, wrote only a summary of the history. Then, at another time, that the same history was written by someone else more at length and that it was translated into Greek by Lysimachus, when Ptolemy Epiphanes and Cleopatra were ruling in Egypt, as is indicated in this same book in chapter 11. Further, what has come down to us is the book in Hebrew by the first author, but of the second author, not the original version but only its translation into Greek.

In the second place they make this objection: the last chapters do not fit in with the first chapters: for, in chapter 2 there is a narration of the plotting of two eunuchs against the king and its discovery by the alertness of Mordecai. Then again the same things are narrated in chapters 11 and 12, but in the prior place the plot is said to have taken place in the seventh year of Ahasuerus, and in chapter 6 it is added that that Mordecai had not received a reward for revealing the plot; but in the latter place it is said to have happened in the second year of Ahasuerus and that Mordecai was rewarded for revealing it.

I respond that those seven chapters of the book of Esther, which are last in the Latin Vulgate edition, are not really last, but some of them pertain to the beginning of the book, like chapters 13,14,15,16, and some at the end like chapter 10, which is evident, both from the Greek codices where all are placed in their proper order, and in the notes of St. Jerome added to chapter 10 and 11 and the remaining chapters of this book in the Latin bibles. The Church has allowed those chapters to remain together at the end of the book where St. Jerome placed them, so that we might understand what part of this book is in the Hebrew codices and also what part is not there.

Therefore the narration of the plot, which is given in chapter 12 in the Latin bibles, really belongs at the beginning of the book, and there the plot is announced by anticipation, which is told again later in chapter 2. It happened in the seventh year as is stated in chapter 2, but not in the second year as it seems to be deduced from chapter 11, since those words in chapter 11, *in the second year of the reign of Artaxerxes,* etc. ought not to be extended to the narration of the plot, but only the things that are said in chapter 11 itself, that is, to the dream which Mordecai saw, before Esther was married to Ahasuerus.

But what is objected about the reward for his reporting the plot does not cause a difficulty. For, although Mordecai did not get a reward for his good deed, when the king ordered chronicles to be read to him, as is said in chapter *6,* still later he received an abundant reward, which is described in the same chapter, and this is signified in chapter 12 by the words, *and he rewarded him for these things.*

Perhaps you will say: if those things are narrated by anticipation, why does it then say in the Greek text: *And after these things it happened in the days of Artaxerxes, etc.?* For the narration says that the banquet of the king took place in the third year of his reign, and Scripture indicates that it took place after the manifestation of the plot, which we said above was held in the seventh year. We respond that the words "after these things" do not refer to the things that were narrated through anticipation, but to the dream of Mordecai which had been narrated in its own place

In the third place they object: that those last chapters conflict with the other parts of this book and so render the whole book suspect. Since in the letter of Ahasuerus, which is recorded in chapter 16, Haman is said to be a Macedonian and to have wanted to transfer the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians. From these words it is gathered that the history of Esther took place in the last times of the Persian kings. For Ahasuerus could not fear lest the kingdom of the Persians be transferred to the Macedonians, unless that kingdom were already of some importance. But the kingdom of the Macedonians was very small until the time of Philip, the father of Alexander the Great, as Justin testifies at the end of book 6, and not at the beginning of Philip's reign, but only in the 21st year did the powers of his kingdom begin to be suspected by the Persians, as Diodorus reports in book 16. But the 20th year of Philip coincides with the 23rd year of king Artaxerxes III (Ochus), as can be known from the chronicle of Eusebius. But in no way can it be that the history of Esther took place after the 23rd year of Ochus. For I ask, who was the king of the Persians who had Esther for his wife? Was it Ochus? But this history was completed not after the 23rd year, but in the 12th year of the reign of Ahasu-erus, as is recorded in chapter 3 of the book of Esther. Was it Arses, the successor of Ochus? But he reigned only for four years; for this reason Darius, the successor of Arses, and the last king of the Persians could not be the husband of Esther; and of course he ruled the kingdom only for six years.

Add to this that if the history of Esther pertained to the end of the Persian kingdom, Mordecai would have lived almost 300 years. For Mordecai was deported with Jeconiah from Jerusalem to Babylon by Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Chaldeans (Esther 2 and 11), and certainly at that time was a grown man; then he lived in captivity 70 years. This means that he would have lived from the beginning of the reign of Cyrus until the end of the reign of Ochus—a total of 220 years. Add 70 years to those 220, and then add the years he had lived before his captivity, and you have almost 300 years. And the difficulty also increases because of Esther. For, since she was the grand-daughter of Mordecai according to the version of Jerome, or a cousin according to the Hebrew and Greek codices, or was of the same age as Mordecai, or a little younger, and when it was a hundred years later, she would have been at least 200 hundred years old when she married Ahasuerus. But who could believe that an old woman of 200 years is that very

beautiful virgin, whom the king of the Persians loved above all others?

We respond: there are many opinions about the time in which Esther lived; and although not all of them are equally probable, nevertheless none is so improbable, that if we were to follow it, we would not be able to refute the proposed objection.

Therefore some authors place the history of Esther before the end of the Babylonian captivity, and say that Ahasuerus was the Father of Darius, a Mede; Daniel mentions him (in chapter 9) as being the one who married Esther. This opinion seems to have pleased Melchior Cano (see book 11, chapter 6 on theological places), and Gerardo Meratori in his chronology. These authors would respond to that objection about Haman, who wanted to transfer the kingdom of the Persians to the Macedonians, that Haman did not wish to make the transfer because the kingdom of the Macedonians already was so flourishing that it could contend with the Persians for control of the world, but rather on the contrary, because, since he was a member of the Macedonian people, he wanted to make his nation, at the time not very powerful, illustrious by translating a great empire to himself and to his own people.

However, this opinion is not probable. First, because the husband of Esther passim is said to be Artaxerxes, which name does not belong to the Medes, since it is proper to the Persian kings.

Secondly, because the husband of Esther ruled from India to Ethiopia (Esther 1). But the Medes never possessed such a vast empire. But we are speaking about the times of the king of the Medes, before the monarchy of Cyrus; for, although at the time the kingdom of the Medes was greater than that of the Persians, as St. Jerome says in comments on chapter 5 of Daniel, nevertheless that kingdom of the Medes was not as extensive as the monarchy of the Persians was later, that is, the kingdom of Ahasuerus, Esther's husband.

Thirdly, because the husband of Esther clearly calls himself both a Persian and the king of the Persians (see Esther 16). But Ahasuerus, about whom Daniel speaks in chapter 9, was from the race of the Medes.

Fourthly, because the husband of Esther recognizes that his kingdom is from the God of the Hebrews (see Esther 16). But nowhere do we read that the Medes worshipped the God of the Jews; about Cyrus and his successors we do read this. For in 2 Chron. 36:23 and in 1 Ezra 1 Cyrus says: *The Lord, the God of heaven, has given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem;* and in 1 Ezra 6 and 7 the letters are read of Darius and Artaxerxes, kings of the Persians, in which these kings acknowledge the God of the Jews and command that sacrifices be offered for themselves and for their kingdom.

Fifthly, because the husband of Esther had his palace in Susa (see Esther 1:2). But in Susa there was not the palace of the Medes, but of the Persians, as is stated by Solinus in chapter 58, Diodorus in book 11, and Plutarch in his life of Artaxerxes. Justinus in book 1 and Q. Curtius in book 4, who write that the palace of the Persians was in Persepolis, are not really opposed to this, For, as Strabo says in book 15, both Persepolis and Susa were royal cities of the Persians. Persepolis was called a royal city because the royal treasury and the tombs of the kings were there; but Susa was so called because the kings lived there. But Cyrus established his residence in Susa because, since that city was located

near the borders of Assyria, Persia and Media, from there he could easily defend and rule the whole empire. Therefore Ahasuerus, Esther's husband, was not a Mede but a Persian.

The opinion of others is that the husband of Esther could not be anyone else but Cambyses, who is also called Ahasuerus in Ezra 4;6. This opinion of the Jews is in the chronology which is called ΤΙΠ, that is, the order of the world; and Gilbert Genebrardus follows the same opinion in his chronology.

Moreover, the Jews count only three kings of the Persians, Cyrus, Ahasuerus and Darius, who was defeated by Alexander the Great. Therefore there remains no question for them about the age of Mordecai and Esther, or about Haman and the kingdom of Macedonia. They prove with two testimonies of the Scriptures that there were only three kings of the Persians. One is in Daniel 11 where, after he had said that there would be three kings in Persia after Darius the Mede, immediately adds this about Alexander: *Then a mighty king shall arise, who shall rule, etc.* The other is in Nehemiah 12, where Nehemiah enumerates the high priests from Jeshua to Jaddua, whom he says was a priest during the time of Alexander the Great. From this it seems to follow that there were only three kings of the Persians, since Nehemiah, who in the time of Cyrus, the first king, was a mature man, lived until the time of Alexander the Great, who destroyed the monarchy of the Persians.

But this opinion of the Jews can in no way be approved by us. For, Ahasuerus, the husband of Esther, reigned for twelve years (Esther 3:7). But Cambyses reigned for only seven years and five months, according to Herodotus in book 3, or only six years, if we believe Josephus the Hebrew (in book 11, chapter 2 of his Antiquities); all the other author agree with them. And the Jews cannot say that Cambyses reigned for many more years with his father Cyrus, since the same Jews say that Cyrus himself reigned for only three years.

Now Cambyses, during the whole time of his reign, pursued the Jews with hatred, and he never allowed the temple to be rebuilt in Jerusalem; this is clearly evident from Ezra 4. Therefore, who can believe that Cambyses is that Ahasuerus who, after the death of Haman, was most friendly towards the Jews? What is this that our Ahasuerus indicates in the last chapter of the book of Esther—that there is a long period between him and the time of Cyrus, since he says, that by the benevolence of the God of heaven the kingdom had been given to his ancestors, and preserved down to his own time? This certainly does not agree with Cambyses who was next to Cyrus.

The basic argument of the Jews about the three kings of the Persians is not a solid one, since not only all Greek and Latin historians contradict it, and also Josephus who belonged to the Hebrew people and religion, but also Daniel and Ezra. For, in Daniel 11:2 after the words: *Behold, three more kings shall arise in Persia,* the prophet goes on to say: *And a fourth shall be far richer than all of them; and when he has become strong through is riches, he shall stir up all against the kingdom of Greece.* With these words clearly Xerxes is being described, who invaded Greece with a huge army.

But in Ezra 4 there is mention of Cyrus who ordered the temple to be built; of Ahasuerus or Artaxerxes who forbade it to be built; and of Darius, who again ordered that the temple should be constructed. Then in chapter 6 another Artaxerxes became king

after Darius, who is also named in Nehemiah 2. But why does Daniel, after mentioning Xerxes, immediately move on to Alexander the Great? The reason is, as St. Jerome writes in reference to this passage, because Daniel did not intend to present a history of the kings, but to proclaim the changes of the kingdoms. Therefore he counted the kings of the Persians up to Xerxes, who waged war against the Greeks, in order to indicate, that hence afterwards the occasion was given for the Greeks to prepare themselves for war with the Persians, and finally under the leadership of Alexander to take their kingdom away from them.

St. Bede in book 3, chapter 32 of his commentary on Ezra refutes the other argument about the number of priests. There he teaches that Nehemiah gave the genealogy from Jeshua to Jeddua, because Jeddua was an infant. For, as we find in Nehemiah 13, during the time of Nehemiah the high priest was Eliasib, the nephew of Jeshua and great-grandfather of Jeddua who, already an old man, was a priest at the time of Alexander; but between the end of Artaxerxes Longimanus, whose butler was Nehemiah, and the beginning of Alexander, there are ninety-five years. Therefore it could very well have happened that Jeddua, who at the time of Alexander was an old man, at the time of Nehemiah was an infant.

Another opinion of some authors is that the husband of Esther was Darius Hystaspis, who succeeded Cambyses. This opinion of John Carionis is in his chronicle, and John Benedictus follows it in his marginal notes to the book of Esther; and although it is more probable than the two previous opinions, still it seems to me that it should be rejected because of the arguments that they adduce in its favor.

They say they think that Darius Hystaspis is our Ahasuerus, both because he had two wives, Atossam and Artystonam, and also because he lived in the city of Susa; both of these points apply to our Ahasuerus in the book of Esther. But Herodotus in book 3 teaches that both Atossam and Artystonam, the wives of Darius, were the daughters of Cyrus; this certainly does not apply to our Esther. But to live in Susa is not something proper to Darius alone, but common for the kings of Persia, as we said above in the quote from Strabo.

Another opinion, and indeed a very famous one, is that Artaxerxes Mnemon was the husband of Esther. Eusebius says this in the chronicle; Bede follows him in this in the book on the six ages, and many other authors also.

But against this opinion there are two serious arguments. First of all, Josephus writes in the first book against Appion that among the Hebrews in the canon of the sacred books those books are not there which were written after the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Since Ezra composed the canon of the sacred books and he did not live beyond the time of Longimanus: but the book of Esther was always in the canon of the Hebrews, as is known from the same Josephus in book 11, chapter 3 of his Antiquities and in the same book 1 against Appion, therefore the history of this book cannot be placed during the time of Mnemon.

Secondly, Plutarch carefully wrote the life of Mnemon, but he does not give even a hint about the things contained in the book of Esther, and in fact he gives just the opposite. For, Plutarch narrates that Artaxerxes Mnemon had two wives, Statiram and Atossa, but

neither one of them could be Vashti or Esther, who were the wives of our Ahasuerus. For, Vashti was repudiated (see Esther 1), and Statira was infested with a poison while she was still queen, and to the great sorrow of the king. But Atossa was never repudiated and lived with Artaxerxes until his death. Indeed, Esther belonged to the Hebrew race, and was married to Artaxerxes in the seventh year of his reign (see Esther 2), and Atossa was not a Hebrew, but a Persian and the daughter of Artaxerxes. But Statira did not marry him in his seventh year; rather Artaxerxes had already married her before he began to reign.

Therefore there is a final opinion and in my opinion it is most probable. For, it is the opinion of Josephus in book 11, chapter 6, and also of Sulpitius in book 2 of the sacred history, and of Nicephorus of Constantinople in the Chronicle, and of many others, whom Eusebius mentions, without their names, in his history. They say that Ahasuerus, the husband of Esther, cannot be anyone else but Artaxerxes, who is called Longimanus; we also follow this opinion, both because the arguments, with which we have refuted the other opinions have no value against this opinion, and also because, if faith is to be given to anyone in this history, it should be given especially to Josephus, who was both a Hebrew and a priest and an expert concerning all things Hebrew. It is also probable that Nehemiah, a Hebrew, could for this reason be the butler of such a king because queen Esther was also a Hebrew, and the Hebrew Mordecai was the Prefect of the palace.

However, they ask, if Mordecai was carried off from Jerusalem to Babylon with king Jeconiah, how can it be that he lived until the time of Artaxerxes Longimanus? I reply that that is not totally incredible; for, from the beginning of the Babylonian captivity to Longimanus there were approximately 163 years; but it is not incredible that at the time Mordecai was more than 165 years old, since long afterwards St. Paul the Hermit reached the age of 115, according to St. Jerome, and we ourselves have seen an old man of 103 so robust and vigorous, that it seemed that he would live many more years.

Further, Scripture says that Mordecai was transferred to Babylon with king Jechoniah; this can be understood rightly, even if Mordecai had not yet been born. If indeed he could be transferred, not in himself but in his parents, or in his ancestors, as Zerubbabel and Joshua are said to have returned from captivity, which Nebuchadnezzar had brought about (see Nehemiah 7), and Zerubbabel was born in captivity (Matt. 1), and the same one most probably is the son of Jeshua, the son of Josedech. And in Gen. 46 and Deut. 10 we read that 70 souls went down to Egypt with Jacob, in which number the two sons of Joseph are included, who were really born in Egypt. And for no other reason can they be said to have entered Egypt, except because Joseph, in whose loins they were, had entered into Egypt.

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE BOOK OF BARUCH

There has been and is a controversy about the book of Baruch, both because it is not found in the Hebrew codices, and also because neither the ancient councils, nor the Pontiffs, nor the Fathers, whom we cited above, who constructed the catalogue of the sacred books, speak about this prophet in clear words. Therefore, from among Catholics John Driedo denies that this book is canonical in book 1 one of his treatise on the scriptures and dogmas of the Church (see the last argument in the last chapter); from the heretics, John Calvin denies it in book 3, chapter 20 § 8 of his Institutes, and Kemnitius in his work on the 4th session of the Council of Trent.

Moreover, the authority of the Catholic Church convinces us of the contrary view; for, the Council of Trent in session 4 counts the prophet Baruch among the sacred books: and in a ferial day of Pentecost she clearly commands to be read a reading from the book of Baruch along with readings from the other sacred books.

Also, testimonies are not lacking of the ancient Fathers, which we can quote against the adversaries. Cyprian in book 2, chapter 5 against the Jews, says: *Likewise in Baruch, this is our God, etc.,* and his Sermon on the Lord's Prayer quotes the letter of Jeremiah, which is the last chapter of Baruch: *Through Jeremiah,* he said, *the Holy Spirit suggests and teaches saying, God must be adored in a sensible way.* St. Hilary in the preface to his Commentary on the Psalms by name places the letter of Jeremiah in the canon. St. Cyril in book 10 against Julian cites Baruch by name. Clement of Alexandria in book 2, chapter 3 of his pedagogy said: *The divine Scripture somewhere says beautifully, etc.* and he cites chapter 3 of Baruch. St. Ambrose in book 1, chapter 2 when writing on faith cites those same words found in Baruch 3:35: *This is our God; No other can be compared to him!* Theodotius explains this whole book and writing in chapter 2 he calls it clearly divine scripture. Eusebius in book 6, chapter 19 in his demonstration of the gospel cites chapter 3 of Baruch, and afterwards he said: *It is not necessary to add anything to the divine words.*

Finally, the ancients passim cite this book under the name of Jeremiah, because Baruch was the secretary and disciple of Jeremiah, as is evident from Jeremiah 36:4, which was the reason why the ancient councils and the Fathers did not place Baruch by name in the canon, because they judged this book to be part of the prophecies of Jeremiah. Clement of Alexandria in book 1, chapter 10 of his Pedagogy cites under the name of Jeremiah the words of Baruch 3:9: *Hear the commandments of life, O Israel,* and also Baruch 4:4: *Happy are we, O Israel, for we know what is pleasing to God.* St. Ambrose in book 1, chapter 8 on penance quotes under the name of Jeremiah some words from chapter 3 of Baruch, and some words from chapter 5; and in book 3, chapter 14 or his treatise on the hexameron he quotes something from chapter 4. St. Basil near the end of his work on Eunomius, and St. John Chrysostom in a prayer saying that Christ is God, while arguing against the Gentiles cite the text in Baruch 3:35, *This is our God* under the name of Jeremiah. St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 33 of *The City of God,* says that

the same text by some authors is cited under the name of Baruch, but by many under the name of Jeremiah. Finally, the same text is cited under the name of Jeremiah by Pope Sixtus I in a letter to all the faithful, by Felix IV in his letter to Peter of Antioch, and by Pelagius I in a letter to Vigilius.

That being the case, Baruch certainly cannot be repudiated, unless Jeremiah is also repudiated. For, just as among the ancients there never was any controversy concerning the book of Jeremiah, so also it must be thought about the book of Baruch that there was no controversy among them about it.

CHAPTER IX

ON CERTAIN CHAPTERS OF DANIEL

The Jews, according to the testimony of St. Jerome in his preface to Daniel, do not recognize the hymn of the three youths, which is given in Daniel 3, nor the history of Susanna, which is found in chapter 13, nor the history of the dragon that Daniel killed, which is recorded in chapter 14. Similarly, Porphyry says the same in book 12, one of the fifteen he wrote against Christians, according to the testimony of the same Jerome in the preface of his commentary on Daniel; also the heretics of this time, like Kemnitius in his study of session 4 of the Council of Trent, and especially the Anabaptists have fallen into the same error.

Not only heretics, pagans and Jews, but also from among Catholic Christians, in times past Julius Africanus repudiated the history of Susanna as forged and written recently, according to the testimony of Eusebius in book 6, chapter 23 of his history. Among more recent authors, John Driedo in book 1 (the last chapter) in his work on the ecclesiastical scriptures and dogmas, and among semi-Christians, Erasmus in his commentary on the preface of St. Jerome to Daniel had the same opinion.

Nevertheless it is certain that all these parts of Daniel are canonical, which is proved first of all from the Council of Trent and from the practice of the Church; this argument should have great convincing power for Driedo and other Catholics. In session 4 the Council sais that these sacred books with all their parts are to be accepted as they are read in the Catholic Church. For, the hymn of the three youths is read, both in the Mass for Ember Saturday in Lent, and on all feast days in the prayers for the office of matins; the history of Susanna is read in the Mass for Saturday before the fourth Sunday of Lent; and finally, the history of the slain dragon is read in the Mass of the third ferial day after the fifth Sunday of Lent. But not just in our time, but also before the year 1200, all those parts of Daniel were read in the Church, as Rufinus testifies in book 2 against Jerome.

Secondly, it is proved by the testimony of the old Fathers. St. Ignatius in his letter to the Magnesians cites the history of Susanna from Daniel 13; Tertullian cites the same passage in his book on the crown of a soldier. St. Cyprian in his sermon on the Lord's Prayer cites the hymn of the three youths and says that it is a divine scripture in which the hymn is contained. We find the same thing in his sermon of lapsed Catholics: *The divine scripture,* he says, *speaks, etc.* and he cites the words of the same youths in the fire. In book 1 of epistle 8 he cites the history of Susanna; in book 4, epistle 6, the history of the dragon, and the same in book 3, epistle 1; again in book 1, epistle 4 in the sermon on the Lord's Prayer, and in his sermon on almsgiving he cites the history of the meal brought to Daniel by Habakkuk. St. Basil in his book on the Holy Spirit (ch. 30), Epiphanius in Ancorato, and St. John Chrysostom in homily 4 to the people—all cite the hymn, or history of the three youths; and in his sermon on the three youths, and in his sermon on Susanna, which are given at the end of the first volume, he explains the same histories and calls them divine. Theodoretus in his commentary on Daniel also connects the hymn of the three youths with the other parts of the same prophet. St. Ambrose in book 3,

chapter 7 of his treatise on the Holy Spirit, while treating the history of Susanna, clearly teaches that it is divine scripture, as are the other parts of the same prophet.

St. Augustine, in chapter 16 of his book on the nature of the good, proves against the Manicheans that corporeal things are good from the hymn of the three youths, where light and darkness, etc., praise the Lord. And in epistle 122 to Victorianus he quotes the prayer of Azariah, which he said in the furnace of intense fire. In his tract 36 on John he refers to the history of Susanna. Origen diligently defends these parts of Daniel, and especially the history of Susanna, and defends it as canonical scripture, both in his homily 1 on Leviticus and in his letter to Julius Africanus. St. Athanasius in his synopsis when he comes to Daniel, and briefly explains the argument of the whole book, with clear words speaks about Susanna, the hymn of the three youths and the slain dragon; and straightforwardly says that all of these belong to the body of the divine scriptures.

Finally, it is credible that the ancient councils, like Laodicea and Carthage III, and the ancient Fathers who used the Greek edition, since they placed Daniel in the number of the Holy Scriptures, spoke about that book of Daniel, which was in the Greek Vulgate codices. But in the Greek Vulgate codices all those parts without doubt were present, as is easily gathered from the synopsis of Athanasius and from the commentary of Theodoretus, and also from the preface of Jerome to Daniel, where he testifies that the Church of Christ read from the edition of Theodotion, in which all these parts are contained.

But the adversaries object, first that the opinion of St. Jerome, who both in the preface to Daniel translated by himself, and in his preface to his commentary on Daniel, indicates sufficiently that those chapters do not have any authority. Jerome himself responds towards the end of his apologia 2 against Rufinus that in those prologues he did not state what he himself thought, but he was reporting what the Jews said.

But Jerome there also calls the history of Susanna and the dragon fables. I respond: when he says they are fables, he wants to say they are histories, which the Jews call fables; I also add that sometimes the ancients under the name of fables, are talking not about fictions, but true narrations. Thus we read in Luke 24:15: *While they were talking (fabularentur) and discussing together, etc.,* and Minucius Felix at the beginning of his Dialogue, which he dedicated to Octavius, calls a certain true narration of unknown derivation a fable. Also Clement of Alexandria in book 3, chapter 23 of Eusebius's History, when he is going to narrate the true history of St. John says: *Listen to a fable that is not a fable, etc.,* as if he were saying—listen to a fable, but not one that is fictitious and false, but one that is certain and true.

Secondly, they object that in the history of Susanna Daniel is introduced as a young boy: *God aroused the holy spirit of a young lad named Daniel.* But this cannot be true, because above in chapter 6 Daniel is said to be one of the Satraps of the kingdom of Darius the Mede, at which time certainly he was not a young lad. Therefore how can it be that afterwards in chapter 13 he is said to be a young lad?

If you should say that the Scripture does not narrate everything in the order of time, but gives first what happened later, and therefore in the Greek codices, where order is maintained, the whole book begins with the history of Susanna. On the other hand, in that chapter 13 it is indicated with sufficient clarity that the history of Susanna took

place at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus, the king of the Persians; for the chapter concludes thus: *When king Astyages was laid with his fathers, Cyrus the Persian received the kingdom.* Therefore, from this chapter we learn that Daniel was a young lad at the time of Cyrus: but this is false. For, the boy Daniel was transferred with king Jechoniah by Nebuchadnezzar from Jerusalem to Babylon, as is stated in Daniel 1. Then from that time until Cyrus 70 years flowed by, as is clear from Ezra 1. Therefore at the beginning of the reign of Cyrus Daniel was about 80 or 90 years old, therefore what kind of a boy was 90 years old?

Add to this that even at the time of Nebuchadnezzar it seems that Daniel was not a young lad, but already before that had died; since Ezekiel, who prophesied during the time of Nebuchadnezzar, and during the fifth year of the captivity, as is said in Ezek. 1:2, mentions Daniel as having died previously; for he says this in chapter 14:14: *If these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job were in it, says the Lord, they would deliver neither sons nor daughters.* Therefore at that time Daniel already had children, and like Noah and Job he was dead.

I respond that the history of Susanna had taken place long before the time of Cyrus, since Daniel really was a young lad, and therefore rightly among the Greeks was placed at the beginning of the book; however, it is not bad among the Latins that it was placed at the end of the book in order that we might understand that it does not exist among the Hebrews. But what is said at the end of chapter 13, after the history of Susanna: *When Astyages was laid with his fathers, Cyrus the Persian received his kingdom*—does not refer to the history of Susanna just narrated, but is the beginning of another history which happened under Cyrus. Therefore in the Greek codices the history of Susanna is chapter 1 of the whole book; but those words, *When Astyages was laid with his fathers*) are placed at the beginning of the last chapter, where the history of the destroyed Bel and of the slain dragon is narrated.

However, St. Jerome responds to that text from Ezekiel in book 1 to Jovinianus; he says that the mention made by Ezekiel of Daniel is not of one dead long ago, but of one now living as a young lad, but that he is numbered among those great men Noah and Job, because he was known to the people on account of the saving of Susanna and his knowledge of dreams; or, as the same Jerome says in reference to Ezekiel 14, because like Noah he saw the happiness of the world before the flood and afterwards the calamity during the time of the flood, and happiness again after the flood. And Job saw his happiness before his temptation and afterwards his misery in temptation, and happiness again after his temptation. So also Daniel saw himself happy in the kingdom of the Jews before the captivity and afterwards a captive and miserable, and finally again happy when he was placed by Darius among the great princes. And it is not necessary that this Daniel had sons and daughters because Ezekiel is speaking with a hypothesis, as if he were to say, even if those three were here, and had sons and daughters, they could not free them from an imminent evil.

Thirdly, they object that what is said in chapter 14 about Daniel being thrown into the den of lions conflicts with what is said in chapter 6. For, in chapter 6 he is said to have been in the den of lions for only one night, but in chapter 14 for six days.

I respond that Daniel was cast into the lions' den once by Darius the Mede, because he had prayed to God contrary to the command of the king, and then he was there only one night, and that this is narrated in chapter 6. But he was thrown in there again by Cyrus because of the slain dragon, and then he was there for six days, as it is said in chapter 14. You can add to this, something that is not improbable, that it is not the same Daniel who freed Susanna, destroyed Bel, and killed the dragon and was in the lions' den for six days, as the one who is treated in the previous chapters. For, Jerome testifies in his commentary on Daniel that formerly many authors had this opinion; also, the Greek edition of the LXX says that this latter Daniel was of the tribe of Levi, as Jerome says in the same place, while it is certain that the prior one was from the tribe of Judah. If this is the true situation, then the two objections just given do not cause any difficulty.

Fourthly they object that the history of Susanna seems to have been invented by some Greek author. For, where we have: *Tell me this: under what tree did you see them being intimate with each other? He answered, Under a mastic tree. And Daniel said, Very well! You have lied against your own head, for the angel of God will immediately cut you in two.* In the Greek there is a certain elegant allusion from the mastic tree to the action of cutting in two; for σχίνος is a tree, σχίζειν means to cut in two; and since one of them said he saw them under an oak tree, Daniel makes an allusion from the oak tree to the action of cutting; for πρίνος is a tree, πρίζειν is to cut: as if someone were to say, Where did you see them? Under an ilex tree; therefore you will be killed on that very spot *(illico).* But in the Hebrew such an allusion could not be made, for what the Greeks call a πρϊνος, we call it an ilex, and the Hebrews say ΠΠΠ. But for to cut, to cut in two, to divide they say: ρηο ypa vow sow p^o.

Origen responds in his letter to Julius Africanus that Daniel did not say an oak tree or a mastic, but something else that we do not know about, but to which according to the characteristics of the Hebrew language or of Chaldean, which he was using, would correspond to some word of cutting. For, Hebrew has several words that mean to split or to cut; also he said that the Greek translator did not translate literally, but according to the meaning, and in order to preserve the allusion he made use of other similar trees, to which in Greek the allusion to a word of "cutting" would correspond.

CHAPTER X

ON THE BOOKS OF TOBIT, JUDITH, WISDOM, ECCLESIASTICUS AND MACCABEES

All of these books are rejected by the Hebrews, as St. Jerome says in his prologue of self-defense. Almost all the contemporary heretics follow the opinion of the Hebrews. The Magdeburgenses in book 2, chapter 4, column 51 accept only those books that the Jews accepted. Martin Kemnitius says the same thing in his consideration of session 4 of the Council of Trent. Likewise John Brentius in the confession of Wirtemberg in the chapter on sacred Scripture, wants to accept only those books about which there has never been any doubt, which are actually only those accepted by the Jews. Calvin in book 1, chapter 11, § 8 in his Institutes accuses the book of Wisdom of lies, an indication of how far he was from accepting it. In book 2, chapter 5, § 18 he says that the book of Ecclesiasticus does not have solid authority. In book 3, chapter 5, § 8 he makes the same judgment about the books of Maccabees. As an antidote to session 4 of the Council of Trent he also seems to repudiate Tobit and Judith. Calvin is followed by those ministers who published a confession of faith at Pisa. Finally, Luther and Zwingli, in the prefaces to the Bibles translated by them, exclude those five books from the sacred canon, and Luther contends in the assertion of article 37, which is about purgatory, that in particular the books of Maccabees have no authority.

But the Catholic Church considers those books, like the others, as sacred and canonical. But before that is proved, it should be noted that the heretics, and especially Kemnitius, do not deny that these books are good, and holy and worthy to be read; however, that they are not of such a nature that firm arguments can be constructed from them. In this way they try to escape the testimonies of the ancients in which these books are called sacred or ecclesiastic. Therefore we will have to prove that these books are so sacred that they contain infallible truth. In the first place this will be proved in general for all of them, and then each one will be treated separately.

First of all, therefore, these books together with the others are placed in the canon by the Councils of Carthage III in canon 47, and Trent in session 4; by the Pontiffs Innocent I in his letter to Exuperius, Gelasius I in his decree on the sacred and ecclesiastic books, together with 70 bishops; finally, by the Fathers—St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 8 of his Christian Doctrine, Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of the Etymology, Cassiodorus in book 1 of the divine readings, and Rabanus in book 2 of the institutes of clerics. That they are listed in these places as books of infallible truth is deduced from the fact that they are counted and listed in the same order with the other books that have infallible truth.

Moreover, the council of Carthage, from which the other councils borrowed this cannon, calls these books not only canonical, but also divine; but for a book to be divine, what else is it but that it has divine authority? Similarly, in the cited places they are said to be canonical and to pertain to the canon; again, when a book is canonical that means that it contains infallible truth.

Certainly the distinction of Kemnitius is meaningless; he says that some of the canonical books have infallible truth, and others do not have it; for, as he himself rightly

inferred from St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 11 against Faustus, and in book 2, chapter 32 against Cresconius, they are called canonical books because they are like a norm or rule, whereby the infirmity of our ignorance is governed, and on the basis of it all other books can be judged. Therefore, how will those books be a norm and rule, if they do not contain infallible truth?

But Kemnitius objects to this in the following manner: St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 8 of his Christian Doctrine says that this is to be noted about the canonical books—that the ones received by all the Churches precede those that are not so received by all, and that they have more authority. But if they all contained infallible truth, one book should not precede another, but all would have the same authority. Additionally, St. Jerome says in the prologue of his self-defense that the canonical books are divided into the law, the prophets and the hagiographa, and he also says in the preface to Tobit and in the preface to Judith that these books are counted among the hagiographa by the Jews, but nevertheless that they are not suitable for confirming dogmas of faith.

I respond that St. Augustine was most certain that all the canonical books have infallible truth; but he was not equally certain about all the books, which he listed, as to whether they are canonical. For, although that was his thinking, still he knew that at that time the matter had not yet been decided by a general council, and accordingly that without falling into heresy some books could be rejected as non-canonical. Therefore, this is what he said should be observed regarding the canonical books: those that are accepted by all should take precedence over those that are not accepted by all. The reason was that then there was more certitude about the prior books than there was about the latter which were canonical. But now, because the general Councils have defined the whole matter, we are equally certain about the authority of all the books, and so we must not place one before another.

But what St. Augustine really thought, namely, that all those books which he calls there canonical, have infallible truth, is clear both from the council of Carthage III, which he signed, and also because not one text from Augustine can be adduced where he says that a book is canonical, and still says that he can have doubts about its truth. On the contrary, innumerable places can be cited where he says that all the books, which are called canonical, contain infallible truth. Thus in letter 19 to Jerome he writes: *I learned to have such fear and honor for those books alone of the Scriptures which are now called canonical, that I most firmly believe that none of their authors committed any error in their writing.* He speaks in the same way in letters 8, 9, 48, 112, in book 2, chapter 3 on baptism, in his commentary on Psalm 67, in book 2, chapters 31 and 32 against Cresconius, in book 3, chapter 5 against Faustus, and elsewhere passim.

Concerning what Kemnitius said about Jerome, I say: The Jews had two kinds of hagiographa—some inside the Ark and some outside the Ark, as Epiphanius teaches in the book on measures and weights. The ones inside the Ark were called hagiographa to distinguish them as historical and prophetic hagiographa, and these were considered canonical, and it is about these that Jerome is speaking in the prologue to his self-defense; but the ones outside the Ark were called hagiographa to distinguish them from the canonical and sacred books, and it is about these that Jerome is speaking in his preface to

Tobit and Judith, From this distinction it is clear that the books, about which there could be some doubt, were never said to be canonical by Jerome.

Secondly, Kemnitius and other adversaries offer this objection. The Church, which existed at the time when the books were written, had doubts about their authority; necessarily, therefore, the Church after that time should have doubts about those same books. For, there are two ways of knowing whether a book is truly divine: one is by the testimony of someone concerning whom it is certain that he was a Prophet or an Apostle to whom God was wont to reveal mysteries; the other, as Augustine teaches in book 33, chapter 6 in his book against Faustus, by the certain testimonies of those who lived when the book was being written, and who testify that the books were written by Prophets or by Apostles, and whose testimonies have come down to us through the succession of the men using those books; for, it is in this way that we judge not only about the sacred books, but also about the profane.

The first way cannot be used now, since now the prophets and Apostles are not living on this earth; therefore we must proceed according to the second way, and from the testimonies of the early Church we must establish certainty about the canonical books. Therefore if the early Church had doubts, much more do we have a reason to have doubts. It is clear from Josephus in book 1 against Appion that the synagogue of the Jews doubted about these books. That the early Church of Christians had similar doubt is clear from Origen, Athanasius, Nazianzen, Epiphanius, Jerome and the other Fathers mentioned above; they do not put these books in the canon and they say openly that there was always a question about these books among learned men.

I respond: that the ancient Church had doubts about these books can be understood in two ways: in one way, that it was so doubtful that there were no men of that time who could testify that those had been written by prophets or apostles, and in this way the aigument has its strength; for, the Church did not receive the book of Henoch, because it did not have any testimonies in its favor at the time when the book was written, nor even in the time immediately afterwards, as St. Augustine teaches in book 18, chapter 38 of *The City of God.* But we deny that the early Church had doubts in this way; for it is certain that there were always some men worthy of faith who thought that these books were canonical.

It can be understood in another way that the Church doubted, because some doubted, but then the Church did not wish to define this matter. And this is certainly true, as the cited testimonies rightly prove; but from that it cannot be concluded that the later Church must also have doubts, and we will prove that in the following way. In the beginning there were doubts about the book of Judith, and nevertheless the synod of Nicaea received this book into the canon, according to the testimony of Jerome in his preface to Judith; the heretics accept this synod along with three others and they consider them to be very important. Therefore, we are not forced always to doubt, even if at one time there were doubts.

Furthermore, if those books of the Old Testament cannot be received now certainly as canonical, because the early Church had doubts about them, for the same reason the letters of James, Jude, Apocalypse, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Hebrews could not

certainly be received as canonical, because there were some doubts about them in the early Church. But the Calvinists receive all these books as truly canonical, as is evident from Calvin's books, in which passim these books are cited, and also from the confession of the Calvinist ministers in article 3 which they adopted at Pissiaci in the year 1561. The Lutherans, although they have differing views about these books, still the Magdeburgenses accept the Apocalypse as truly canonical in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, column 56.

But regarding their objection about the two ways of discovering the authority of books—I admit those two ways and that now there are no prophets or apostles, and that it is necessary to proceed according to the second way, etc.; but I say, so that the later Church could discern that a book is canonical, that it suffices if she has some testimonies of men worthy of belief who lived during that time, or certainly shortly thereafter.

Therefore, we do not say, as Kemnitius shamelessly and falsely accuses us of saying, that the Church, that is, the Pope can, according to his own choice and without the testimony of the ancients, make a book canonical from those that are not canonical, and from canonical to non-canonical; and if the Pope should so wish, the divine scripture would not have any more authority than Aesop's fables. For those are not our statements, but his lies. Thus we confess that the Church can in no way make a canonical book from those that are not canonical, nor vice versa; but that she can only declare which book is to be held as canonical, and that she cannot do it rashly or arbitrarily, but from the testimony of the ancients and from the similarity of the books about which there is some doubt, those concerning which there is no doubt; and finally, from the common opinion and practice of the Christian people, as St. Jerome says, in his book on famous men concerning James; thus he letter of James gradually with the passage of time merited authority.

Now in declaring these books canonical the Church observed these three norms. For, first of all, she had the testimonies of the ancients concerning each book; and although testimonies from the synagogues of the Jews are not had, still they are had from the apostolic Church, and this is sufficient. For the Apostles, without other testimonies, sought to declare those books canonical, which is what they did; otherwise Cyprian and Clement, and others, whom we will cite, would never have said so uniformly that they are divine. Next, they saw that they are in conformity with the others. And finally, they saw that those books gradually were received by all Christians as canonical; this is an argument that those who lived in the early Church could not have had.

The last objection goes like this: The Church accepts those books that St. Jerome accepts; she rejects those that he rejects, as is clear from distinction 15 of the holy Roman canon; but St. Jerome in the prologue to his self-defense, and in the prologue to the book of Proverbs says that these five books are not canonical. So also the Catholic Cajetan, a pious author, argues at the end of his commentary on Esther.

To this some respond that St. Jerome only says that they are not canonical among the Jews, and certainly in the prologue of his self-defense together with those books of the Old Testament he cites also the book of the Shepherd Hermas, which belongs to the New Testament, and at the same time he says that all of them are not canonical; therefore he is

not speaking only about the canon of the Jews. Moreover, in his prologue to Proverbs he says: *Therefore just as the Church reads Judith, and Tobit, and the books of Maccabees, but does not recognize them as being among the canonical books, so also these two volumes*—Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus—*she reads for the for the edification of the people, but not to confirm the ecclesiastical authority of dogmas.*

I admit, therefore, that Jerome had this opinion, because a general council had not yet decided anything about these books, with the exception of Judith, which Jerome also later accepted. But what Gelasius I says in distinction 15 of the holy Roman canon is to be understood about the books of the doctors, like Origen, Rutinus and of similar authors, but not about the sacred books, as is clearly deduced from the canon itself.

CHAPTER XI

ON THE BOOK OF TOBIT

Now we will treat the individual books separately, and we will both defend them with proper arguments and briefly refute the special objections raised against them. Now, therefore, the book of Tobit, besides the common testimonies of the councils and of the Fathers cited above, has the important testimony of St. Cyprian, who said in his sermon on almsgiving: *The Holy Spirit speaks in the Scriptures, and he says, sins are forgiven by alms and faith.* Pope Callistus I in his 2nd letter while referring to Tobit says: *Holy Scripture says well...* St. Ambrose in chapter 1 of his book on Tobit says that this book is prophetic scripture. Likewise St. Basil in the prayer on avarice appeals to the opinion described from Tobit as a divine precept. Also St. Augustine in his Speculum says that he is going to collect various ideas from the canonical books, and he does not omit Tobit.

But contrary to that it is customarily objected that this book seems to contradict itself. For, in chapter 3 it is said that Sarah, whom the younger Tobias was going to marry, lived in Rages, a city of the Medes, where we read that Gabael was (Tobit 4). Later, however, in chapter 9, when Tobias arrived at the place where Sarah was, from there he sent the angel to Gabael in Rages; therefore it is not true that the home of Sarah was in Rages.

Michael Medina in book 6, chapter 14 on the right faith in God thinks in chapter 3 "Rages" is read by a mistake in Scripture, since in Greek it is ἐν ἑκβατάνοις. But it is hardly credible that such an error could take place, since there is no similarity between Rages and Ecbatana. Others, like Lyranus, say that either there were two Rages in Media, or that certainly in chapter 3 Rages is meant, not the city itself, but some place nearby; for, some one is said to live in Rome, who actually lives in Tusculum or some other place outside of Rome. This opinion is more common, and more true.

CHAPTER XII

ON THE BOOK OF JUDITH

St. Jerome in his preface to Judith says that the book of Judith has excellent testimony from the Council of Nicaea I, generally the first and most famous of all the general councils. And lest perhaps Kemnitius should say that the book of Judith is holy, but does not have full authority in order to confirm dogmas of faith, the words of St. Jerome should be noted: for, the holy doctor says that, among the Hebrews, the book of Judith is counted among the holy books, but among those which are not suitable for proving dogmas of faith; then to this opinion of the Hebrews he opposes the authority of the Council of Nicaea. Therefore, according to Jerome the Council of Nicaea so counted the book of Judith among the number of the sacred books that it considered it to be suitable for confirming the dogmas of faith. On this point Julius Africanus in book 1 in his treatise on the divine law, and Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of his etymology bear witness that the Church of Christ honors and preaches this book as being among the divine books.

But there is a very difficult objection against this book. For, this history seems to be veiy contradictory, since in chapter 5 it is said that it took place after the return of the people from the Babylonian captivity, and nevertheless it is said in chapter 1 that at that time Nebuchadnezzar, king of the Assyrians, was fighting against Arphaxad, king of the Medes, who had built Ecbatana, and these things in no way are in agreement: for, at the time when the people returned from captivity, the monarchy of the Assyrians had been destroyed, and not Nebuchadnezzar, but Cyrus, or Darius was ruling the Assyrians, and the Persians and the Medes.

This great difficulty in a marvelous way has tested the ingenuity of learned men. There are two main opinions about this. One is of those who want to place the history of Judith after the Babylonian captivity, some of whom refer it to the time of Cambyses, whom they want to be Nebuchadnezzar, like Eusebius in the chronicle, Augustine in book 18, chapter 28 in *The City of God,* Bede in the book on the six ages, Lyranus on chapter 1 of Judith, John Driedo on ecclesiastical scriptures and dogmas in book 1, chapter 2, part 2 and in book 3, chapter 5, part 3. Some place it in the time of Darius Hystaspis, like Gerard Mercator in his chronology, and some others. Severus Sulpitius in book 2 of his sacred history thought that it was during the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus.

Another opinion is that of those who teach that the history of Judith took place before the Babylonian captivity. But some of these refer it to the time of king Zedekiah, like Gilbert Genebrardus in book 2 of his chronology; and some put it in the time of king Josiah, like John Benedictus in his marginal notes to Judith 4.

But none of these opinions seem to be sufficiently probable, and indeed the first three are refuted with obvious arguments. First, Arphaxad, against whom Nebuchadnezzar waged war, built Ecbatana (see Judith 1), but who built Ecbatana, according to Herodotus in book 1 and Eusebius in the chronicle, was Dioclese V, king of the Medes, who lived a long time before Cambyses, and Darius Hystaspis, and Ochus. And what Pliny writes in book book 6, chapter 14 is not convincing, that is, that Ecbatana was built many

years after the time of Dioclese, or what Diodorus writes in book 2, ch. 7 that Ecbatana already existed during the time of Arbacis, and Dioclese was the fifth king after him. For it can easily have happened that that ancient city was destroyed several times and then rebuilt—now by Dioclese, now by Seleucus, now perhaps by some other king.

Secondly, nowhere do we read that the kings of Persia were called Nebuchadnezzar, neither in sacred nor in profane history, but only the Babylonian kings; therefore, neither Cambyses nor Darius is that Nebuchadnezzar who is involved in the history of Judith.

Thirdly, Nebuchadnezzar, who is mentioned in the book of Judith, reigned in Nineveh (see Judith 1), but during the time of Cambyses and Darius and Ochus Nineveh did not exist, for Nebuchadnezzar, King of the Chaldeans, had destroyed it in the first year of his kingdom, as Genebrardus reported in his chronicle, or certainly Ciaxares, King of the Medes, as Herodotus says in book 1 and Eusebius in his chronicle. Certainly Nahum, who prophesied in the time of Hezekiah, openly predicts that the destruction will take place soon. Consult the commentary of St. Jerome. Add to this the fact that the kings of Persia did not reign in Nineveh, but in Susa or Babylon, as can be known from the book of Daniel, and from the book of Esther, and from all the profane histories.

Fourthly, Nebuchadnezzar, who is mentioned in Judith 1, attempted to occupy Cilicia, Damascus and Palestine, but Cambyses and Darius did not strive to do that, because they already possessed those regions in peace, as is evident from the book of Ezra, chapters 4 and 5.

Fifthly, the sons of Israel prepared themselves for battle against Nebuchadnezzar (see Judith 4), but during the time of Cambyses and Darius the sons of Israel were not able to resist any kings, and especially the Persian kings, under whom they were so subject that only with their approval could they begin or cease building the temple, as can be seen in books 1 and 2 of Esdras.

Sixthly, during the time of Judith the high priest was Eliakim, who was also called Joakim (Judith 4 and 12), but during the time of Cambyses and Darius Hystaspis it was Joshua Josedech, as is clear from Nehemiah 2 and Zechariah 3. But during the time of Ochus the high priest was Jaddua, who met Alexander the Great, or certainly his father Jonathan, as is gathered from Nehemiah 12.

Seventhly, the sons of Israel feared lest Nebuchadnezzar would destroy Jerusalem and the temple of the Lord (Judith 4), but at the time of Cambyses neither Jerusalem nor temple existed, because they had already been destroyed and burned by the Chaldeans; but during the time of Darius Hystaspis the temple was rebuilt, but not the city of Jerusalem. Moreover, since by the command of Darius the temple had been rebuilt (Ezra 6), how is it credible that the Jews feared lest it would again be destroyed by him?

Eighthly, Holofemes asked (Judith 5), what people is this that lives in Judea, in what does their power consist, who is their king, how many of them are there? But certainly the king of the Persians, and his princes could not be ignorant of any of this, since a short time before he had sent the Jews back to their home.

Ninthly, the sons of Israel, when they were preparing themselves for war against Holofemes, surrounded their villages with walls throughout all Samaria all the way to Jericho (Judith 4), but at the time of Cambyses and Darius the Jews did not live in

Samaria, but the Gentiles did, as is stated in Ezra 4; and the Jews could not surround Jerusalem itself with walls; that was much more the case with the surrounding villages.

Tenthly, it is stated at the end of the book of Judith that there was peace in Israel during all the time when Judith lived and for many years afterwards; but Judith lived 105 years, as is recounted in the same place. But after the 13th year of Ochus, when according to Sulpitius the war was waged by Holofemes, to Ptolomy Lagi, who again made war with the Jews, there are only thirty years; therefore, at that time Judith had to be about 80 or 90 years old.

Eleventhly, Nebuchadnezzar in the 13th year of his reign waged war against the sons of Israel (Judith 2), but Cambyses reigned only eight years, according to Herodotus in book 3; therefore he is not that Nebuchadnezzar.

Twelfthly, there is an added probable conjecture from the number of ancestors of Judith herself. For, in the book of Judith, chapter 8, the fathers and grandfathers and other ancestors of Judith are listed to Simon the son of Ruben, or as the Greek codices seem to have it more correctly, the son of Israel, and there are only fifteen; but in Ezra 7 the ancestors are listed of Ezra himself, who lived at the time of Cambyses and Darius until Aaron, and they are found to be seventeen, to which if you add the others to Levi, the brother of Simeon, there will be twenty. Therefore, since from the patriarch Jacob to Judith there are many fewer generations, than there are from the same Jacob to Ezra, it is rightly concluded that Judith was much older than Ezra, who, however, as we have said, lived during the time of Cambyses and Darius.

Now those last opinions, which place the histoiy of Judith at the time of Zedekiah or Josiah, are refuted with two reasons. The first reason is this. In the last chapter of Judith we read that there was no one who harassed Israel during the whole time of Judith's life, and for many years afterwards. But Judith lived, as we read there, to her hundred and fifth year, and she was not an old woman but a young girl when she killed Holofemes, as is known because she is called a young woman in Judith 12. Therefore there was peace in the land of Israel for eighty or ninety years. But from the beginning of the reign of Josiah, until the war, which the king of Egypt began against Jehoahaz, the king of Judah, there were only thirty years (2 Kings 23), but from the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah until the war, which Nebuchadnezzar started, there are only nine years (2 Kings 24). Therefore unless Judith, when she killed Holofemes, was about 80 or a hundred years old, it cannot be true, what Scripture says, during her whole life and for many years thereafter there was no one who attacked Israel.

The second reason is because at the time of Judith the high priest was Eliakim, who is also called Joakim, as is clear in Judith 4 and 15, but during the time of Josiah the high priest was Hilkiah (2 Kings 23), but during the time of Zedekiah it was Saraiah (2 Kings 25).

Therefore it seems to us what should be said is that the history of Judith took place in the time of Mannaseh, king of Judah. If indeed at that time the ruler of the Medes was Dioclese, who built Ecbatana, according to Eusebius in the chronicles, and our Scripture calls him Arphaxad. Likewise, at that time the kings of Assyria ruled in Nineveh, as is certain from 2 Kings 19 and from Tobit 4. But it is credible that the one who is called

Nebuchadnezzar in the book of Judith, was also given another name, Merodach-baladan, who was also the king of Babylon. For, after Sennacherib, Esarhaddon reigned towards the end of the reign of Hezekiah, the father of Manasseh (2 Kings 19); after Esarhaddon, Merodach-baladan reigned and he is mentioned in 2 Kings 20, Jeremiah 50 and also in Isaiah 39. He was the king of Babylon who took over the kingdom of the Assyrians and so after him there is no mention of the kings of Assyria, but only of Babylon.

He began to rule in the third year of Manasseh, probably and as we gather from conjectures (for the certain beginning of his reign cannot be learned from any approved author), and so his thirteenth year, when he started the war against the Jews under the command of Holofemes, coincides with year 16 of Manasseh, whom shortly before the captivity he carried off to Babylon.

At that time Jerusalem and the temple of the Lord were still in existence, mention of which is made in Judith 4. Also the high priest Eliakim was living at that time, as is clear from the chronology of Nicephorus, the patriarch of Constantinople, who when recording the high priests of the Jews, places Eliakim between Shebna who was the high priest under Hezekiah, and Hilkiah who had the office at the time of Josiah. But it is established that Manasseh ruled between Hezekiah and Josiah, and that agrees with 2 Kings 18, where Eliakim is named among the principal priests, and agrees even more with the prophecy of Isaiah in chapter 22, where the deposition of the corrupt Shebna is predicted and the elevation of Eliakim to take his place.

Furthermore, for this reason it is easy to find that long time of peace, which was during all of Judith's life, and then afterwards for many years. For, Manasseh at the beginning of his reign was very evil, and because of that, by permission of God, he was defeated by the king of Babylon, who devastated the land of Judah, and carried off the conquered king to Babylon. However, then he acknowledged his sin, and having been returned to his homeland, he lived peacefully, as is recorded in 2 Chron, 33.

From this captivity of Manasseh until the reign of Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, there was great peace in the land of Judah. Scripture does not say how long this period was, but a span of 72 years is easily calculated. For, Manasseh reigned 55 years, of which I accept 39 after his captivity. For it is certain that his captivity happened at the beginning of his reign, as Josephus also noted in book 10, chapter 5 in his Antiquities, and as we said above, the thirteenth year of the king of the Assyrians and Babylonians coincides with the sixteenth year of Manasseh. Two years are to be added to the 39 years, during which after Manasseh his son Amon reigned (2 Kings 21), and so there will be 41 years. Thirty-one years are then added to them during which, after Amon, Josiah reigned according to 2 Kings 22, and so we have 72 years.

Now we will show that this same period of time was after the death of Holofemes until the end of Judith's life. Judith lived to be 105 years old (we get this number from the end of the book of Judith—*a* number derived more clearly from the Greek text); from this number should be deducted the number of years she lived before she killed Holofemes, which I take to have been forty. For, although I cannot determine the time exactly, since no author reports it, still it could be that, more or less. For, at that age she could still have been beautiful, and to be judged by the Assyrians as a young girl because

of her incredible beauty, especially because, as is stated in Judith 10, the Lord conferred on her, not without a new miracle, a certain outstanding splendor, so that she appeared to the eyes of all to be incomparably beautiful. Although also naturally some women so preserve the form of their body that, even if they are grandmothers, still they are judged to be young women. Certainly Sarah at the age of 65, or even of 90, seemed to be so young and beautiful that wherever she went, she was loved and carried off by kings. See Gen. 12 and 20. Now therefore if 40 years are deducted from the 105, 65 years are left of continuous peace until the death of Judith, to which I then add seven more, so that it may also be true, which is added in the book of Judith, that after her death for many years no one attacked Israel; therefore we have the 72 years we were seeking.

Perhaps you will say: If this history took place during the time of King Manasseh, why in the preparation for war, which is narrated in this book, is there no mention of the king? Why is this whole affair attributed to the high priest?

I respond: perhaps this war took place during the captivity of Manasseh and therefore, since the king was absent, the affairs of the kingdom were conducted by the high priest. Also, perhaps there is no mention of the king, because the war did not reach as far as the city of Jerusalem, where the king was.

But what is said in Judith 4, that the priest Eliakim wrote to all the Hebrews, and circulated it around all Israel, in order to exhort them to show constancy, is not at all surprising. For also in the time of Hezekiah the same Eliakim, although he was not yet the high priest, did many things in the name of the king, as is clear from 2 Kings 18; and Isaiah had predicted in chapter 22 that it would happen that Eliakim would become like the father of all the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And so it is especially credible that at that time important and dangerous affairs were handled by the high priest, when the king returned from captivity and had been converted seriously to God. For, although it is not improbable that the war was waged while the king was still in captivity, still it seems to be more probable that it took place after he had returned.

But you will object again: it is clear from the fifth chapter of Judith that the war of Holofernes against the Jews took place a short time after their return from the Babylonian captivity, for this is what we read: *When they departed from the way which God had appointed for them, they were utterly defeated in many battles and were led away captive to a foreign country; the temple of their God was razed to the ground, and their cities were captured by their enemies. But now they have returned to their God, and have come back from the places to which they were scattered, and have occupied Jerusalem, where their sanctuary is.*

I respond: this place should not be understood to be about the Babylonian captivity, but of various preceding afflictions. For, if it were speaking about the Babylonian captivity, the Jews would not be said to have been exterminated by many nations, but by one, namely, the Chaldeans; nor would it say that many were taken away captive, but all of them. For, the Babylonian captivity was general, since only a very few were left there by Nebuchadnezzar, and very soon they fled to Egypt (see 2 Kings 25). Therefore the dispersion and the desolation was complete.

Therefore Scripture is speaking about the various afflictions of the Jewish people,

which were suffered at various times and from different nations, but especially from the last one which happened when Manasseh was captured; for then the whole region was devastated, and the king himself was captured with many others and taken to Babylon; many others were dispersed and fled to various places. But when this is added: *But now they have come back from the places to which they were scattered, etc.* either it is understood to be about the return of king Manasseh with his companions from Babylon, or (if the war took place in the absence of the king) it can be understood to be about the return from those places to which they had fled, when the king of the Assyrians plundered their region.

But someone should not say, what is added in the Greek text, that the temple was also destroyed when the Jews were dispersed. For, those words seem to be an interpolation, since St. Jerome, who faithfully translated this book from the Chaldean language into Latin, says nothing about the destruction of the temple in his translation. And perhaps that addition to the Greek text was the reason why so many serious authors like Eusebius, Augustine, Sulpitius and Bede were deceived into placing this history at that time.

CHAPTER XIII

ON THE BOOK OF WISDOM

The book of Wisdom has the testimony of the ancient councils and Fathers. The council of Sarda, in a letter to all the bishops, which Theodoretus in book 2, chapter 8 of his history, from chapter 7 of this book proves that the Son of God is the maker of all things and the true God; also the council of Toledo XI calls the book of Wisdom Holy Scripture.

Finally, the Fathers teach the same thing. For, Dionysius in chapter 4 of his Divine Names cites it as a book of Holy Scripture. Melito of Asia in his letter to Onesimus places Wisdom in the catalogue of the sacred scriptures. Cyprian in his book on the rule of virgins said: *When the divine scripture says: What profit is there for us in pride, etc.* Likewise, in book 2 on Julian, near the middle, he calls it divine scripture. St. Augustine *ex professo* teaches and proves that dogmas can be confirmed from this book, and that the book is canonical (see book 1, chapter 14 on predestination).

And although Kemnitius with incredible shamelessness cites this place in Augustine in a mutilated way, and says openly that one can gather from this place that for Augustine this book was not divine and of infallible truth, let us hear the whole passage in which he said: *What was stated also by me,* doubtless testimony about the book of Wisdom, *you said that those brothers so rejected it, as if it were not used regarding a canonical book. It is as if, after having given testimony for this book, the matter itself is not clear, that we wanted to be taught by it.* Kemnitius cites this.

But let us hear what is stated in the same chapter later on: *The judgment of the book of Wisdom should not be repudiated; it merited in the Church of Christ to be recited from the pulpit by the readers in the Church of Christ with great extended recognition, and to be heard with the veneration of divine authority by all Christians, by bishops and even to the lowest lay person, to the penitent faithful and the catechumens.* And further on he says: *It is necessary that they place this book before all handlers, since recent famous authors placed it also before the times of the Apostles, who as witnesses, believed that they were not using anything but a divine testimony.* And you can add to this that all the ancient authors said that this book came from Solomon; accordingly it obviously follows that it is canonical. Eusebius says in book 4, chapter 22 of his history that Hegesippus and Irenaeus and all the ancients thought that this book came from Solomon. For the same reason Tertullian in his prescription, Cyprian in a sermon on mortality, Hilary on Psalm 127, Ambrose in sermon 8 on Psalm 119, Basil in book 3 against Eunomius, Epiphanius on the heresy of the Anomoeans cite this book under the name of Solomon. But what St. Jerome says in his preface to the book of Solomon, namely, that this book is thought by many to be from Philo the Jew, and St. Augustine says in book 2, chapter 8 in his work on Christian Doctrine that it is from Jesus, son of Sirach, is not contrary to the common opinion of the doctors. For, the sentences indeed are from Solomon, not from Philo, as the ancients say, and this is very clear from chapter 9:7-8, where the author of the book says: *Thou hast chosen me to be king of thy*

people.,, and Thou hast given command to build a temple on thy holy mountain, etc., nevertheless these sentences have been borrowed from someone else; by many authors he is thought to be Philo, not the one who lived after Christ, but another older one, who translated the sentences of Solomon into Greek, at the dictation of the Holy Spirit, as in book 25 of Proverbs the proverbs of Solomon are said to have been copied into a book by the men of Hezekiah king of Judah, since perhaps before that they were on leafs of paper. But St. Augustine retracted his opinion in book 2, chapter 4 of his Retractions.

John Calvin in book 1, chapter 11 § 8 of his Institutes says that the book of Wisdom contains a lie: *On the origin of idols,* he said, *there is more or less a public consensus about what is said in the book of Wisdom: namely, that the first authors are those who offered this honor to the dead, so that they might superstitiously cultivate their memory; and truly I confess that this perverse custom was very old, and I do not deny that there was a funeral torch, whereby the madness set on fire the attraction of men to idolatry; but I do not concede that this was the first source of the evil. For, that idols were in use before the display grew strong of consecrating images of the dead (and there is frequent mention of this among profane authors) is certain from the words of Moses; when he narrates that Rachel had stolen the idols from her father, he speaks about it as if it were a common fault.* This is what he says and so he clearly maintains that what is said in Wisdom 14 about the origin of idols is false. But Calvin assumes a falsehood and then creates another one. For he assumes that before the time of Rachel there were no idols which represented the figure of a men; and since it is certain that at the time there were some idols, he concludes, that the first idols were not images of men, as the book of Wisdom teaches. But he is assuming something false; for, first of all, the idols that Rachel stole were images of men, or rather, an image of a man. For, there was only one image, but Scripture uses the name of a multitude, because that word in Hebrew does not have a singular form. The Hebrew word is ownn which indeed signifies an idol, which represents the figure of a man, and which spoke and gave answers in the way of a devil. It is clear from 1 Sam. 19:13 that is the figure of a man, where Michal, since she wanted to rescue David from the hands of Saul, let him down through a window, and in the bed, in his place put an image which looked like a man; in Hebrew it is DWin for what we mean by a statue or image. But that those idols could speak is clear from Ezekiel 21:21, for there we read, *he consults the teraphim;* in Hebrew it is D'onn and likewise in Zechariah 10:2 where we read: *The teraphim utter nonsense.* Then it is certain that Bel was the first king of Assyria, who was before Rachel, indeed also before Abraham, and after this death he was thought to be a god, as Eusebius relates at the beginning of his Chronicle; and his statue, set up by his son Nino, was the first idol set up publicly for worship; Ambrose teaches this in his first chapter on Romans, or whoever was the author of those commentaries, and St. Cyril towards the end of book 3 on Julian. Finally, that the beginning of idols was the fabrication of human images in memory of the deceased, as the book of Wisdom teaches, is testified to by St. Cyprian at the beginning of the book on the untruth of idols, by Chrysostom in homily 87 on Matthew, by Hegesippus in Jerome's book on illustrious men, and by others passim.

But you will object: if the statue erected to Bel by his son Nino was the first idol, how can it be true what the book of Wisdom says—that the first idol was made by a father in memory of his son? I respond that the statue of Bel was the first idol set up publicly for worship; but the first idol absolutely was the image of a dead son made by his parent, and honored privately. For, because of that, and as this perverse custom grew stronger (as is said in the same chapter 14 of Wisdom), such images began to be worshipped publicly by the command of tyrants.

CHAPTER XIV

ON ECCLESIASTICUS (SIRACH)

Calvin vehemently hates the book of Ecclesiasticus, because from it many dogmas of the Faith are proved convincingly. He said in the Antidote: *From what source can they better draw the dregs?* But he does not really have anything to object to it. We on the contrary can confirm the authority of this book by the many testimonies of the ancients. Clement of Alexandria, towards the end of book 7 of his Stromata, while citing chapter 4 of Ecclesiasticus says: *Let us confirm the following Scriptures as what has been said.* St. Cyprian in book 3, letter 9 while citing chapter 7 said: *But Solomon, established in the Holy Spirit, bears witness and teaches.* Epiphanius against the heresy of the Anomoeans counts among the sacred and divine books the Wisdom of Solomon, and the book of the son of Sirach, that is, Ecclesiasticus. From this we understand that the same Epiphanius, when he says in the book on measures and weights that these books are not accepted, is speaking about the opinion of the Jews. St. Ambrose, in book 4, chapter 8 in his treatise on faith, said that the words of Ecclesiasticus in book 24 are divine oracles. St. Augustine in his book for Orosius against the Priscillianists said: *Divine Scripture cries out—do not seek anything higher;* this is a quote from our Ecclesiasticus. Finally, Clement and Cyprian in the cited places, Sixtus II in the letter to Gratus, Damasus in the letter to the Bishops of Italy, Basil in book 4 against Eunomius, Ambrose on chapter 7 of 1 Cor., Jerome on chapter 10 of Ecclesiasticus, and Gregory in book 10, chapter 14 not only cite this book, but they also attribute it to Solomon. However, there never was any doubt but that Solomon was held to be the author of a canonical and divine book. But Epiphanius against the heresy of the Anomoeans, and some others say that the author of this book is Jesus, the son of Sirach. I respond that it could easily be the case that Jesus, the son of Sirach, gathered together into one volume the sayings of Solomon which he had carefully assembled, so that both can be said to be the author.

CHAPTER XV

ON THE BOOKS OF THE MACCABEES

The books of Maccabees, besides the common testimonies, have the testimony and are cited in a respectful manner by St. Cyprian in chapter 11 of his book on martyrdom, by St. Gregory Nazianzen on the prayer of the Maccabees, by St. Ambrose in book 2, chapters 10,11,12 of his writing on Jacob, and by others passim who say clearly that these books are divine scriptures. St. Cyprian in book 1, letter 3 to Cornelius, and Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of his Etymologies, and St. Augustine (to whom Calvin often attributes great authority) in book 18, chapter 36 of *The City of God* said: *The books of the Maccabees, which not the Jews but the Church reveres as canonical·* And in book 2, chapter 23 against the letters of Gaudentius he zealously defends the authority of the same books, calling them Holy Scripture. Now let us consider the arguments of the adversaries.

In the first place, in book 3, chapter 3 § 5 of his Institutes Calvin objects that the author of these books praises the preposterous zeal and the superstitious deed of Judas Maccabeus, who ordered a sacrifice to be offered for the dead (2 Macc. 12:43). For, in addition to the fact that it is superstitious to pray for any dead persons, there is also the fact that these men, for whom Judas ordered the prayers, died under the burden of a lethal crime, for whom even Catholics teach that one should not pray; but it is clear that that is how they died. For, as is said in the same place: *Then under the tunic of every one of the dead they found sacred tokens of the idols, which the law forbids the Jews to wear,* which is stated in Deut. 7:25.

I respond: to pray for the dead, concerning whom it is not certain that they are in heaven or in hell, is a pious and religious act, as we shall show in its own place. Now it will be sufficient to oppose Augustine to Calvin, who from this very passage proves that it is pious to pray for the dead in letter 61 to Dulcitius, in book 1, chapter 23 on the customs of the Church, and in chapter 1 of his book on care for the dead. Therefore there is such a great difference between the spirit of Augustine and of Calvin, that Augustine, because he believes that the books of Maccabees are canonical, concludes from them that it is good to pray for the dead; but Calvin thinks that it is evil to pray for the dead, and hence concludes that the books of the Maccabees are not canonical. Now concerning the objection, I respond that Judas piously thought that they at the moment of death had sorrow for their sin in the sight of God, and found mercy from the Lord, which is signified by these words: *And they turned to prayer, beseeching that the sin which had been committed might be wholly blotted out.*

Secondly, Calvin objects in his Antidote of the Council: it is not possible to regard as canonical the author of this book, because in the last chapter of book 2 he asks for forgiveness of his errors. Add to this what he says in chapter 2:26: *For us who have undertaken the toil of abbreviating, it is not light matter but calls for sweat and loss of sleep.* With these words he is indicating that he composed this book in a human manner; for, the truly sacred authors wrote not by their own talent and labor, but by the revelation of the Holy Spirit, as is clear from Jer. 36:4 about Jeremiah, who dictated with such ease

to his secretaiy Baruch the things God revealed to him that he seemed to be reading from a book.

I respond that God is indeed the author of all the divine scriptures, but he is wont to be present to the prophets in one way, and in another was to others, especially to the historians. For, he revealed future things to the prophets and at the same time assisted them lest they state something false in their writing, and so the prophets did not have any other work except to write or to dictate. But God did not always reveal to other authors the things they were going to write, but moved them to write what they had seen or heard and could still remember, and at the same time he assisted them lest they write something false. This assistance did not excuse them from putting effort into thinking and in searching for what and how they should write. Accordingly, St. Luke in the preface to the gospel written by him says that he searched out everything diligently that pertained to the writing of the gospel, and he did it from those who themselves had heard or seen, and were ministers of the word. But concerning what pertains to pardon, this author does not seek a pardon for errors, since he knew that there were none, but for a less elegant way of speaking, just as Paul confesses in 2 Cor. 11:6 that he is unskilled in speaking.

The third objection comes from others. In 2 Macc. 1:19 it is said: *When our fathers were being led captive to Persia.* But it is certain that the Jews were taken captive not to Persia, but to Babylon; therefore, the author of this book is not narrating true history. Some authors have tried very hard to deal with this problem that the Jews were taken to Persia, but I think it can be handled easily. For, the author of this book calls Persia not only the region which properly is called Persia, but also other neighboring areas. This is clear from 1 Macc. 6:5, where the messenger who came in Babylon to Antiochus, is said to have come to him in Persia. And this way of speaking is not unknown to other authors, since Chrysostom in homily 6 on Matthew says that the Jews were liberated from their Persian captivity.

The fourth objection is based on 2 Macc. 2:5 where it says: Jeremiah, when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed and burned by the Chaldeans, hid the tent and the ark of the covenant in a cave on Mount Nebo, and he said that that place would be hidden until God again united his own people. But two lies are contained here. One is that Jeremiah did this, for before the city was captured by the Chaldeans, Jeremiah was already in prison and was not seen by almost all the people in Jerusalem, as is recounted in Jer. 37 and 38; therefore he could not do this either by himself of by others. But after the city had been captured the Chaldeans destroyed everything, as is reported in 2 Kings 25, and so nothing remained that Jeremiah could have hidden away. The second lie is that, returning again from captivity, they would have the ark and the tent, because they never had them afterwards.

I respond: that could very well have happened, both before the destruction of the city and the temple (as Epiphanius says in his life of Jeremiah) and also afterwards, as others say. Indeed before: not during the time of Zedekiah but of Jehoiakim, for Nebuchadnezzar came to Judea three times, and led away captive the king and people. First, during the time of Jehoiakim, as reported in 2 Chron. 36. Secondly, during the time of Jehoiakim, as stated in 2 Kings 24. Thirdly, during the time of Zedekiah according to 2 Kings 25.

However, although at the time of Zedekiah Jeremiah was almost always in prison, and unseen by all, nevertheless during the time of Jehoiakim he was free and enjoyed great authority, so that it is believable that as a result of his persuasion Jehoiakim by his own free will turned himself over to the king of Babylon. For it is certain that Jeremiah urged this (Jer. 27), and it is also certain that Jehoiakim did it (Jer. 29). Therefore, with the consent of the king it was possible to carry away the ark and the tent. Also, he could have done it after the city was captured, for Jeremiah was held in high regard by Nebuchadnezzar, as is made clear in Jer. 39. It is quite evident from Jer. 52 that the tent and the ark were not taken away by the soldiers when they were plundering the city of Jerusalem; for, in that text, everything is listed that the Chaldeans took away from the temple of the Lord, including the censers and the large basins, but there is no mention of the ark and the tent. And the other point is not a lie, that the ark was found again when the people were once again gathered together; for, Jeremiah did not speak about the assembly which took place in the time of Cyrus; but either about the last time, which precedes the day of judgment, as Epiphanius says in his life of Jeremiah, or it is to be understood mystically that the ark is going to appear, that is, that Christ in the flesh will come for the new assembly of the people, as Rupert explains in book 10, chapter 21 on the victory of the word.

The fifth objection. In 1 Macc. 1:1 Alexander the Great is said to have been the first to reign in Greece, and this seems to be false, since Alexander was not the first, but before him there were many kings of the Lacedaemonians, Macedonians, Corinthians, Athenians, etc., as is clear from the chronicle of Eusebius. Moreover, in the same place Antiochus Magnus is said to have reigned during the 137th year of the kingdom of the Greeks. However, it is certain from the same Eusebius that Antiochus reigned in the year 156, for there are that many years from the first year of the monarchy of the Greeks until Antiochus.

Finally, in 1 Macc. 8:16 the Romans are said to trust one man each year to rule over them and all obey the one man; but this is false, for at that time there were two consuls.

I respond: the Scripture, when it says that Alexander was the first to rule in Greece, is not speaking about just any kingdom, but about the monarchy of the Greeks; and when it says that Antiochus the Great ruled in the 137th year of the kingdom of the Greeks, it is not counting the years from Alexander, but from Seleucus, who after Alexander I ruled in Syria, as Eusebius says in the chronicle; for, since Judea is a part of Syria, the Jews number the years from the first king of Syria. But from Seleucus to Antiochus there are 137 years, and if you add to that 19 years, which are from Alexander to Seleucus, there will be 156 years. And to the point about the Romans I respond: only one consul is mentioned, because according to the custom of the Romans the rule was that the consuls governed on alternate days. The unhappy outcome of the battle of Cannae is witness to this matter, the cause of which was the temerity of the other consul, who was in command of things on that day. Therefore, although there were two consuls, it seems that the governance of the republic was committed to one. That policy was instituted from the very beginning of the consular dignity, lest perhaps (as Livy says in book 2) if the two consuls governed at the same time, by acting as kings, the fear of tyranny might seem not to be removed but to be doubled.

The sixth objection. In 1 Macc. 4 Judas is said to have purged the temple in the year 148, that is, one year before the death of Antiochus, who died in 149, as is stated in 1 Macc. 6; but that contradicts 2 Macc. 10 where it is said that Judas purged the temple two years after the death of Antiochus. Moreover, in book 1 chapter 6 Antiochus the Great is said to have died in Babylon on his bed from grief of soul, because his plans had not succeeded as he had hoped. But in 2 Macc. 1 it says that he was cut to pieces along with many of his associates in the temple of Nanea; and again in 2 Macc. 9 he is said to have died from internal injuries, because he had fallen from his moving chariot. Finally, in 1 Macc. 9 Judas is said to have died in the year 152, but in 2 Macc. 1 he is said to have written a letter in the year 188 which, if it were true, he would have written it 36 years after his death. All of these facts, since they do not agree with each other, offer clear indications of falsehoods.

To the first part of this argument Sixtus of Siena, in order to respond, writes in book 8 of the holy library, that the cleansing of the temple had taken place twice; but that does not seem to be true nor to be necessary for the solution of the argument. And that it is not true Scripture shows sufficiently, because everything that it says about this cleansing in one place, it reports also in another place. But that it is not necessary is proved from this fact, because, granted that there was only one cleansing, there is no repugnance in its being reported in two places in this book. For, although the cleansing of the temple in 1 Macc. 4 is narrated before the death of Antiochus, and in 2 Macc. 10 it is reported to have been after the death of Antiochus, nevertheless in this latter place it is indeed narrated after the death of Antiochus, but it is not said that it took place after the death of Antiochus. For the author wanted to finish what he had to say about Antiochus, and then finally return to Judas and the cleansing of the temple. But this was said to have been done after two years; this does not mean two years after the death of Antiochus, but two years after the desecration. For, the temple was desecrated in the year 145, as is said in 1 Macc. 1, and after two years it was cleansed again in 148, as we read in 1 Macc. 4. Therefore rightly Eusebius in the chronicle, and Josephus in book 12, chapter 10 of the Antiquities, write that the temple was cleansed again in the third year from the desecration, that is, after the biennium just completed.

In what pertains to the other part of the argument, almost all authors agree that it is the same Antiochus, who was called Epiphanes; his death is described in 1 Macc. 6 and in 2 Macc. 9; for in his journey he could have been afflicted with internal pains, and have fallen from his chariot, as is reported in 2 Macc. 9, and afterwards arrived sick in Babylon; and he could have died there, given the additional grief of soul because of the news given him about the failure of his soldiers in Judea. But about the Antiochus, whose death is recounted in 2 Macc. 1, there is a very important question. Some say he was Antiochus the Great, like Lyranus on this place and some others, but this cannot be the case. For, Antiochus the great died before Judas, who wrote this letter, was the leader of the Jews, and there was no war between the Jews and Antiochus the Great. Other say that he was Antiochus the son of Demetrius, who is also called Triphon or Griphus by Eusebius. Thus also Rupert in book 10, chapter 6 in his essay on the victory of the word; but neither can this be true. For at the time of that Antiochus, not Judas but John

Hircanus was the leader of the Jews, and nevertheless Judas writes the letter. Moreover, the letter is written to Aristobulus, the teacher of Ptolomy Philometor, who it is certain from Eusebius in his chronicle at the time was in Judea, that is, a long time before the time of Antiochus Griphi.

Therefore it is necessary to say that this Antiochus is Antiochus Epiphanes, the very one who is mentioned in 1 Macc. 6 and 2 Macc. 9, because then Judas, who wrote the letter, was living, and also Aristobulus to whom it was written. Moreover, of the kings of Syria he was the first and greatest enemy of the Jews, so that deservedly there was such great joy in Israel when he died.

Finally, what is said in 2 Macc. 9 about Antiochus the Great, that he wanted to plunder the temple in Persepolis, and shamefully fled away, agrees completely with what is said here about that Antiochus, because he fell in the temple of Nanea and was struck dead, and because many of his soldiers were tom limb from limb. And it is not necessary to say that he died there where he is said to have fallen; for, he can be said to have fallen because his army was put to flight and fled. In this regard, divine scripture narrates in Gen. 14 that the king of Sodom fell in battle, and nevertheless shortly thereafter it introduces him as living and running to meet Abraham. Therefore Antiochus in this sense is said to have fallen, since his army was defeated and beaten; and he having fled in shame and perhaps also wounded, in his flight he fell from the chariot and died soon afterwards.

Some respond to the third proof in the following way: it was not Judas Maccabeus, but someone else who wrote the letter. Thus Rupert in book 10, chapter 15 of his victoiy of the word, but that does not seem to be true. For, in the year 188 not Judas, but John Hircanus was the leader of the Jews. And there was no leader of the Jews who was called Judas except the one Maccabeus; and it is not probable that someone other than the principal author should be named in the title of the book. Others say that this Judas is indeed Maccabeus, but they want to count up the years which are placed at the beginning of the book, not in the manner of the Greeks from Seleucus, but in the manner of the Hebrews from the twelfth year of Assuerus, when all the Jews were freed from being killed—a work of Esther. This is the position of Lyranus and Cardinal Hugo concerning this place, and almost all recent authors follow them. But first of all, it does not seem credible that in these books the years are always counted according to the Greek way, except in this one place: then also by counting from the twelfth year of Assuerus, the year 188 cannot coincide with the times of Judas Maccabeus. For Lyranus, whom the others follow, computes it like this: from the 12th year of Assuerus until the end of his kingdom there are 29 years; to these are added the six years during which Darius, the son of Assuerus, reigned, and that gives 35; and if 148 years are added to that, which is the number of years from the beginning of the kingdom of the Greeks until Judas, there are 188 years.

But in this computation there are three serious errors. First, that from 29 and 6 and 148 the total is not 188 but 183, as is obvious. Secondly, that these authors omit 19 years, which are from the beginning of the monarchy of Alexander to the kingdom of Seleucus; for, those 148 years of the Greeks, which are counted in 1 Macc. 4 until the victory of Judas, are counted from Seleucus, not from Alexander, as we said above. Therefore, if

you add the nineteen years from Alexander to Seleucus, all the years will be 202 from the twelfth year of Assuerus, not 188, as they say. The third error is that in that computation they make Assuerus the penultimate king of the Persians, following the counting of the Jews rather than the opinion of all the Latins and Greeks. Eusebius in the chronicle after Assuerus places three more kings; Josephus, whom I have followed above, lists seven kings after Assuerus. From this it follows that, from the twelfth year of Assuerus until Judas, the number of years was not 188 but more than 200.

Therefore, with Melchior Cano and some others I think that the question should be answered so that we may say: those words *in the 188th year* are not the beginning of the following letter which Judas wrote, but the end of the preceding letter which was written by the whole people of the Jews under the leadership of John Hircanus. This is indicated clearly by the Greek codices, which after those words *in the 188th year* make a distinction, and reason certainly demands that, since those words are between the beginning of one letter and the end of another, and the number of years usually is placed at the end rather than at the beginning, we refer them to the preceding letter, not to the following one.

The seventh objection is taken from the fact that the first book of Maccabees seems to conflict with the gospel. For in 1 Macc. 1 the author of the book says that the prophecy of Daniel has been fulfilled concerning the abomination of desolation in the holy place, when Antiochus Epiphanes set up an idol in the temple of the Lord. But Christ in Matt. 24 says that that prophecy will be fulfilled in the last days. I respond: in the books of Maccabees there is no mention of the prophecy of Daniel, but only that the idol of Antiochus is called the abominable idol of desolation, as it truly was.

The last objection which some authors raise concerns the fact that, in those books those men seem to be commended who killed themselves, such as Eleazer in 1 Macc. 6 and Razis in 2 Macc. 14 was answered a long time ago by St. Augustine in letter 61 to Dulcitius, and in book 2, chapter 23 against the letter of Gaudentius, and the heart of his response is this: that the deaths of these men is narrated in Scripture, not praised, or certainly not so praised as if what they did they did piously and in a holy manner, although it cannot be denied that they acted boldly and manfully, and in the judgment of men, courageously.

CHAPTER XVI

ON CERTAIN PARTS OF THE BOOKS OF MARK, LUKE, JOHN

That the last chapter of Mark at the time of St. Jerome was not accepted by all as canonical is clear from the letter to Hedibias, question 3. The reason for the doubt was because of the apocryphal words, which had been added to that last chapter, as is evident from Jerome in book 2 against the Pelagians (before the middle of the book). For these words had been inserted which quite clearly manifest Manicheism: *And they made reparation saying that the world was the substance of iniquity and incredulity, which does not allow through unclean spirits that the true power of God be apprehended, therefore now reveal your justice.* Now we cannot doubt about this, for the Council of Trent orders that the whole books be received with all their parts, as they are read in the Catholic Church; but this chapter is read in the important days of the Resurrection and Ascension, and the same is expounded by Bede, and by St. Gregory in homilies 21 and 29 on the Gospels. Athanasius also in the synopsis of the Gospel according to Mark acknowledges this chapter as truly coming from Mark, and likewise Augustine in book 3, chapter 24 on the agreement of the gospels. Finally, it is unbelievable that the Gospel of Mark was so mutilated and shortened that it contained nothing about the Resurrection. Add to this that Calvin also in chapter 17 § 47 of his Institutes admits this last chapter of Mark as part of the gospel, so that it is not necessary here to expend more effort in order to prove this point.

In chapter 22 of Luke some authors have doubts about the history of the bloody sweat of Christ, and the appearance and consolation of the angel, as Hilary says in book 10 on the Trinity, and Jerome in book 2 against the Pelagians. The reason that moved them to this position was lest they seem to attribute infirmity to Christ and sorrow of mind. And for the same reason Epiphanius says in Ancorato that some Catholics, with a perverse zeal from the words of Luke 19:41, *when he saw the city he wept over it,* deleted the verb "he wept." But certainly they had fear where there was no fear. For if Christ, as man, could fear and be sad because of his imminent passion, as also Matt. 26 and Mark 14 testify, why could he not for the same reason sweat and accept the angelic consolation? And if he had a passible body and sensitive soul, why could not feel sorrow and weep? Therefore Athanasius in book 6 to Theophilus, which is about the beatitude of the Son of God, declares an anathema on those who deny the bloody sweat of Christ. Epiphanius also in Ancorato, and Augustine in book 3, chapter 4 on the agreement of the gospels, recognize this passage of Luke as canonical; neither do Hilary and Jerome in the cited places teach the contrary, but only point out that at their time it did not exist in all the codices, and because of that there was some doubt about it.

That the beginning of chapter 8 of John, where the history of the adulteress is given, formerly did not merit certain faith is taught by Erasmus in his notes on this passage taken from book 3, chapter 39 of Eusebius's history, where he speaks about Papias in the following way: *He adds a certain history about an adulterous woman, who was accused by the Jews in the presence of the Lord; but it is given in the gospel that it is said that*

that parable was written by the Hebrews. With these words he indicates clearly that he did not find this history in the gospel of John, and that it seemed to him to be not history but a parable. Nevertheless there should not be any doubt but that it is both history and evangelical, since it is read in the Church on the Saturday after the third Sunday of Lent, and important Greek and Latin Fathers acknowledge it: Ammonius of Alexandria in his evangelical monotessaro, Athanasius in his synopsis of John's Gospel, Chrysostom in homily 60 on John, Ambrose in letter 58, book 7 to Studius, Jerome in his book against the Pelagians, and Augustine in tract 33 on John. Augustine also says the same thing in book 2, chapter 7 on adulterous spouses, namely, that that history had been erased from some codices by the enemies of the true faith.

What Eusebius writes is not opposed to our position, but rather strengthens it. For, he says that Papias, a disciple of John, remembered this history, and that is a sign of its truth. But that Papias did not have it in his own codex of the gospel makes little difference, since perhaps it had been erased by someone. Add to this that it is probable that Eusebius is not speaking about this history of an adulteress, but about some other apocryphal event. For in the Greek text of Eusebius the word "adulteress" is not used, but he says: περί γυναικός έπι πολλαϊς άμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης.

On these words that are given in 1 John 5:8: *There are three who give witness in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one,* Erasmus contends at length in his notes on this passage that at one time there was a doubt, and that now there should be doubt. But certainly these words are read publicly in Church on the first Sunday after Easter (Low or White Sunday). Cyprian acknowledges the same place in his book on the simplicity of prelates, Athanasius in book 1 for Theophylus, which is on the one deity, Pope John II in his letter to Valerius, Jerome in the prologue for the canonical epistles, Idacius in his book against Varimundus, and Eugene of Carthage in book 2 of Victor on the persecution by the Vandals. Therefore there is no doubt that those words are a true part of the divine scriptures.

CHAPTER XVII

ON THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS

There have been two doubts about this letter—one about the author and the other about its authority, but they are connected in such a way that there are very few who have doubted about one and not about the other. First of all, therefore, concerning the ancient heretics, Marcion according to Jerome in his preface to the letter to Titus; and Arius, according to Theodoretus in his preface to the letter to the Hebrews, taught that the letter to the Hebrews was not written by Paul and that it is not sacred. Of the recent heretics, Luther in his prologue to the letter to the Hebrews contends that this letter is not by Paul nor by any Apostle, because it contains some things contrary to the evangelical and apostolic doctrine. Brentius supports Luther in the Wirtenberg confession in the chapter on sacred scripture, and Kemnitius in his study of session 4 of the Council of Trent, also the Magdeburgenses in book 2, chapter 4, col. 55, and some other heretics of this time, except the Calvinists. For, Calvin in the 1554 edition of his Institutes (ch. 8 § 216) contends that this letter is truly apostolic, and that the Lutherans are in error on this point; but whether it is by Paul, or another apostle, like Barnabas or Luke, Calvin has his doubts, as is clear from the same Institutes (ch. 10 § 83 and ch. 16 § 25); therefore the Calvinist ministers, in the confession which they made at Pissiaci in article 3, place this letter in the number of the divine scriptures, but as being of uncertain authorship.

Besides these manifest heretics, that also certain Catholics, and especially Latin ones have had doubts about the author of this letter, is testified to by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 3 of his history, and also St. Jerome in the essay on Paul in his book on illustrious men, where he says: by certain Latin authors it is denied that this letter is by Paul, but they say that it is by either Barnabas, or Luke, or the Roman Pontiff Clement. Sixtus of Siena in book 7 of his holy library adds that it is attributed also by some to Tertullian. In our time, Erasmus at the end of his notes on this letter, and Cajetan at the beginning of his commentary on the same letter, have again brought to light a question that has been dormant for a long time.

Nevertheless it can easily be proved that this letter is both canonical and by the Apostle Paul. First, since under the name of the Apostle Paul it is read in the Church on the day of the birth of the Lord and frequently elsewhere. Secondly, because it is quoted and accepted as being from Paul by many ancient Pontiffs, like Clement I in his letter to the Corinthians as found in Eusebius in book 3, chapter 8, Innocent I in letter 3 to Exuperius, Gelasius I in the council of the 70 Bishops. Thirdly, because it is placed in the canon of the sacred scriptures under the name of Paul by the council of Laodicea in canon 59, Carthage III in canon 47, and Trent in session 4, and it is also acknowledged as being from Paul by Nicaea I according to the testimony of St. Thomas in his comments on this letter; and by Ephesus I and Chalcedon when approving the twelve chapters of Cyril, of which the tenth reads like this: *Christ, the divine Scripture says, has become High Priest and Apostle of our confession, etc.,* and also by Orange II in the last canon where it is said to be by the Apostle and divine Scripture.

Fourthly, since it was always accepted by all the Greek Fathers, as is clear, both because all cite it as a letter of the Apostle, and because St. Jerome affirms it in his letter to Dardanus, and also because all who expound on the canon count this letter with the other Pauline letters, like Origen in Eusebius (book 3, chapter 18 of his history), and Eusebius himself in book 3, chapter 3, Gregory Nazianzen in the song on the canon of Scripture, Athanasius in the synopsis, Epiphanius in heresies (76), and Damascene in book 4, chapter 18.

Fifthly, it was also accepted by all the Latins after Lactantius. For, only Tertullian, Cyprian, Lactantius and Amobius do not seem to acknowledge this letter, because they never cite it, so far as I know. But Hilary in book 12 on the Trinity, Ambrose in book 2, chapter 2 on Cain, Jerome in his letter to Dardanus on the promised land, Augustine in book 2, chapter 8 on Christian doctrine, and Rufinus on the Creed, and others after that in succession all acknowledge it as Pauline, and frequently quote it. Indeed, Philastrius, in the catalogue of heresies, does not hesitate to number among the heretics those who either reject that letter or deny that it was written by Paul. So the uncertainty of two or three Latins should not be placed before the very certain confession of all the others.

Sixthly, St. Peter seems to make mention of this letter. For, Peter wrote his first letter to the Hebrews dispersed among the nations, as is clear from the introduction, and as Oecumenius teaches, and even as Erasmus himself contends at the beginning of his notes to this letter. And he wrote the second letter to the same people, as is gathered from these words in chapter 3: *This is now the second letter that I have written to you, beloved.* But in the same chapter he adds later: *So also our beloved brother Paul wrote to you.* Paul, therefore, according to the testimony of Peter, wrote a letter to the Hebrews.

Finally, this letter, according to the consensus of all Catholics, is either by Paul, or Luke, or Barnabas, or Clement of Rome, or Tertullian. But it cannot be by Tertullian, since Clement of Alexandria, who lived some time before Tertullian, says in book 6, chapter 11 of Eusebius's history that this letter is by Paul. How can that be, since Tertullian himself thought that this letter was by Barnabas, as Jerome says in his book on illustrious men concerning Paul? Nor can it be by Clement of Rome, since Clement himself cited it as being from the Apostle Paul in his letter to the Corinthians, as Eusebius reports in book 3, chapter 38 of his history, and finally when at the end of this letter the author says: *I urge you the more earnestly to do this in order that I may be restored to you the sooner.* For, those words in no way can be applied to Clement, who, since he was the Roman Bishop, would be living not in Judea but in Rome. From these points it is apparent how ineptly Erasmus at the end of his comments on this letter tries to make Clement its author. Finally, the arguments given above sufficiently prove that the letter was not written by Luke nor by Barnabas, nor anyone else except Paul. But even if it were by Luke or Barnabas, it would come from apostolic men, and so it would not lack apostolic authority.

But the Magdeburgenses propose five arguments against this letter, whereby the arguments of Luther and Erasmus are at the same time embraced. The first is because prudent antiquity had doubts about this letter. I respond: it is inept to say that antiquity had doubts about this letter, since they can cite only a certain Gaius from the Greeks

and two or three from the Latins, while we on the contrary have in our favor so many Pontiffs, so many councils, all the Greeks with one exception, and all the Latins, with two or three exceptions. And if in antiquity there is no question about a multitude, Clement of Rome is older than Gaius, and Clement of Alexandria than Tertullian, and Dennis the Areopagite is older that both of them, and he cites this letter under the name of Paul in his own letter to Titus.

The second argument is because the name of Paul is not included at the beginning, as all the other letters have it, although they themselves in the same place admit that this argument is not a very strong one. I respond with Jerome in the preface to the letter of blessed Paul: therefore, if it is not by Paul, because it does not have Paul's name prefixed to it, then it is by no one because it has the name of no one. What is this, since the first letter of John does not have his name prefixed, and still there is no doubt that it is by John? And on the other hand, the gospels of Thomas, Bartholomew, James and Nicodemus begin with their names, but not undeservedly they are rejected by all.

I add, moreover, that for some good reasons Paul did not add his name to this letter. For he did it either, as Jerome says in the same place, because he knew that his name was unknown to the Hebrews who were already converted to the faith, because he more than others strongly argued that the Old Law had been abrogated and they were still devoted to that Law (see Acts 21); or, as the same Jerome teaches in his comments on Galatians 1, because in this letter to the Hebrews in chapter 3 he was going to say that Christ is the Apostle of our confession, and at the beginning in his usual way he did not want to call himself Paul the Apostle lest he seem in some way to compare himself with Christ. Or finally, as Theodoretus teaches in the preface to his commentary on this letter, because Paul was not the Apostle of the Hebrews but of the Gentiles, as he says in Gal. 2:2, Paul the Apostle did not want to begin in the usual way, but he wanted to explain pure doctrine, not as an Apostle or teacher, but as a friend and companion. Therefore at the end of the letter he says: *I appeal to you, brethren, bear with my word of exhortation, for I have written to you briefly,* as if he wanted to say: Do not take it badly, if I who am not your proper Apostle, wish to admonish and exhort you with this letter. For I did it in order to console you, not to dominate over you. Clement of Alexandria touched on all these reasons as recorded in book 6, chapter 11 of Eusebius's history.

They take the third argument from the diversity of style, since the language of this letter is much more grave, more eloquent, more ornate than that of the other letters. And he would not prove his point sufficiently who said that this letter was written in Hebrew, and that the Apostle could speak better in his own language than in a foreign language, that is, Greek. But that this letter was not written in Hebrew but in Greek is evident, both because the testimonies cited in this letter are taken from the Septuagint, and also because the author of the letter in chapter 7 interprets the Hebrew name of Melchizedek, that is, king of peace, which he would not do, if he were writing in Hebrew.

Some respond and say that this letter was not first written in Hebrew but in Greek, and indeed contains the ideas of Paul, but the words of Luke, or of Clement, whom Paul used as his interpreter or secretary. And therefore they say that this letter is more ornate than the others, because the language of this letter is not that of Paul as in the

other letters, but was composed by someone else more eloquent. Thus Origen in book 6, chapter 16 as found in Eusebius. Others think that this letter was written first in Hebrew and then translated into Greek by Luke or by Clement. This is the response of Eusebius in book 3, chapter 38 of his history, and Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius in book 3, chapter 11. The interpretation does not contradict this response: for the Apostle does not interpret the Hebrew name of Melchizedek in Greek, but in Hebrew in order to prove something from the etymology and the power of the name. As if in Latin someone should say that homicide is the killing of a man; and in Greek Δωρόθεος is δωρον Θεού. Thus in Hebrew pis is f?» ρτχ: and yet if the interpreter had added an interpretation it would not be absurd, as we find in Exod. 12:27, *For it is the Passover, that is, the passing over of the Lord,* which interpretation is not given in the Hebrew; and in Matt. 27:46 , *Eli, Eli, etc., that is, my God, my God, etc.* And there is no problem because of the scriptures cited according to the version of the Septuagint: for, if the Apostle wrote in Hebrew, he would have taken his quotes from the Hebrew text; nevertheless the Greek interpreter wanted to translate the words cited by Paul, just as the same Septuagint had translated them before, lest something new be offensive to the ears of the Greeks. And it is not new, for how many testimonies in the Hebrew language did the same Apostle use in the sermon which he gave in the synagogue at Antioch? But Luke reports all of them in Acts 13 according to the Septuagint version. Of these two solutions, although both are probable, still the first one seems to be both more simple and more convincing.

The fourth argument, on which the Magdeburgenses rely greatly, goes like this: the author of this letter in chapter 2 places himself in the number of those who have been converted to the faith by the Apostles, for he says: *How shall we escape if we neglect such a great salvation? It was declared at first by the Lord, and it was attested to us by those who heard him, while God also bore witness by signs and wonders, etc.* But Paul in Gal. 1 strongly affirms that he learned the gospel not from a man, not through a man, but from Christ; therefore Paul is not the author of this book.

I respond first that Paul said these things not about himself, but about the men of his time, just as Isaiah in chapter 64:6 says in the person of the people: *We have all become like one who is unclean, and all our righteous deeds are like a polluted garment... There is no one that calls upon thy name, that bestirs himself to take hold of thee;* in this place it is clear that Isaiah is not talking about himself, because there he calls upon God with a long prayer. Furthermore, I add that it is not absurd if Paul places himself in the number of those who have been confirmed by the Apostles; for here he is not dealing with a confirmation through doctrine, but through miracles. For he says that salvation, that is, the preaching of salvation has been confirmed by the Apostles, while God approved it with signs and prodigies. But who can deny that Paul, after his conversion, although he fully learned the gospel through revelation, nevertheless was confirmed in his faith by the miracles of Peter and of the other Apostles, and in particular by the miracle whereby he received again the sight of his eyes through the hands of Ananias?

The fifth argument: the author of this letter opposes the teaching of the Lord; for the Lord says in Matt. 11:28: *Come to me all, etc.;* but the author excludes those who have sinned once; for, this is what he says in chapter 6:4: *It is impossible to restore again*

to repentance those who have once been enlightened. And in chapter 10 he says that there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins for those who deliberately sin after having received the knowledge of the truth. And in chapter 12 he says that Esau did not find an opportunity for repentance.

I respond that this text does not conflict with that *Come to me all* any more than the words of the Lord in Matt. 12:31-32 conflict with it where he says that blasphemy against the Holy Spirit will not be forgiven, either in this world or in the future world. For the Apostle is not speaking about just any sinner, but about the one who sins against the Holy Spirit, that is, who deliberately rejects the known and experienced truth.

In addition, such sins are said to be unforgiveable for three reasons. First, because usually men of that sort are not converted, nor are those kinds of sins forgiven, although such a conversion absolutely is possible, and sometimes really does happen; as in bodily ailments, we call those incurable that usually are not cured, although sometimes they are cured; and we call those ailments curable that usually are cured, although sometimes they are not cured. Secondly, although those who sin against the Holy Spirit directly resist grace, by which alone they could be cured, like someone who cannot be cured unless a vein is cut, and he does not accept this remedy, the doctor rightly says about him that it is not possible to cure him; but it is not denied that another very wise doctor could persuade the sick person to accept the letting of his blood. Thirdly, someone who sins out of malice has nothing in himself as a basis for meriting forgiveness and for that reason his sin is said to be unforgiveable, although absolutely it could be forgiven. But someone who sins out of ignorance or weakness has something with which he may call forth the mercy of God, according to what the Apostle says in 1 Tim. 1:13: *I received mercy because I acted ignorantly in unbelief.*

And this response seems to be sufficient in order to remove the difficulty, which arises from the previous places. Also another one can be used. For, many authors, and almost all of them, explain the prior passage given in Heb. 6, like Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Oecumenius, Theophylactus, Anselm, Sedulius and others commenting on this place, and also Augustine at the end in his explanation of the beginning of the letter to the Romans, on the renewal for repentance that takes place in baptism; not for that which takes place in reconciliation after baptism. For, that St. Paul is speaking here about baptism is indicated sufficiently by the words: *Not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works of faith towards God, with instruction about ablutions, etc.* and then these words: *Those who once have been enlightened.* For, in chapter 2 of Dionysius's ecclesiastical hierarchy, and in other ancient authors, baptism is said to be an enlightenment, because it is the sacrament of faith. And these words—*to restore again to repentance:* for, as Augustine teaches in the cited text, by baptism we are really renewed, by reconciliation we are cured. Finally, those words: *They crucify again the Son of God:* for in baptism we imiate the death of Christ, and his burial, as is said in Rom. 6, and just as Christ died only once, so also we can be baptized only once. St. Paul, therefore, is arguing against those who abandon the faith and he teaches that no one ought to hope thaL after his baptism received in the Church, he can lay a foundation elsewhere and find another baptism. For, that is impossible, since there is only one true

baptism and it cannot be repeated. The second text has the same meaning. For truly *for those sinning deliberately, that is,* for those abandoning the already known and accepted truth of the faith, *there no longer remains a sacrifice for sins;* not because there is no opportunity for repentance, but because there is no truly efficacious sacrifice except the death of Christ, which they despise by their apostasy. For, no other Christ can be found, nor another baptism, in which his death is represented.

I say to the matter in chapter 12: in two ways Esau found no opportunity for repentance: in one way regarding his father, because his inheritance had been lost irreparably; in another way regarding God, because he did not repent properly, as Chrysostom explains this passage. The Apostle, therefore, wishing to deter men from falling away, proposes the uncertain result of penance. For just as Esau could not recover his inheritance, because it was irreparable, so the sinner cannot recover innocence, virginity, and such like things; and just as Esau did not repent rightly, although he did weep, and therefore did not please God, so often sinners seem to do penance, and still they do not please God, because they do not do penance as they should.

The sixth argument is that of Cajetan in his commentary on this letter. The author of this letter proves in chapter 1 that Christ is the Son of God with the words from 2 Sam. 7:14, *I will be his father;* and these words are understood literally to refer to Solomon, and strong arguments are taken only from the literal sense; therefore, either this author is not Paul, or Paul is not using a certain argument.

I respond: the Apostle argues in a similar manner in Rom. 10 and 1 Cor. 9, but it cannot be said, either that these letters are not by Paul, or that Paul is not arguing in a firm way. Therefore the argument of the Apostle is very solid, since those to whom he was writing admitted that Solomon was a type for Christ, and they could not deny this, as St. Augustine proves in his book on the unity of the Church in chapter 8. For, in both 2 Sam. 7 and Ps. 72 many things are said about Solomon that do not apply to him except that he was a figure of Christ. Such as this: *I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever.* And again: *May he have dominion from sea to sea... and may all kings fall down before him, all nations serve him, etc.*

The seventh argument of the same Cajetan is this: In Heb. 9 the author says that in the Ark there was a golden urn holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tablets of the covenant; but in 1 Kings 8 it says that only the tablets of the covenant were in the Ark. Therefore, either Paul is lying, or the author of this letter is not Paul.

I respond that at the time of Solomon there was nothing in the Ark except the tables of the covenant, as is stated in 1 Kings 8, but that afterwards the urn and the rod were also placed in the Ark by the Jews; this is something Paul could know from tradition. This is the solution of Theophylactus, who also says that the Jews of his time knew this. You can add to this also that the author of the book of Kings, when he says, *But in the Ark there was nothing but the two tablets,* seems to be hinting that at his time there was something else in it which was not there during the time of Solomon. For he seems to want to say, although now there are some other things in the Ark besides the two tablet, nevertheless when the Ark was installed in the temple by Solomon, there was nothing in it except the two tablets. But what if also, as some say, the urn and the rod were in a

place outside the Ark, but not inside the Ark itself?

The last argument comes from Erasmus and Cajetan. The author of this letter in chapter 9, while speaking about the testament in the proper sense, which is confirmed by the death of the testator, quotes the words of Exod. 24:8: *This is the blood of the covenant which God has commanded you',* but in Exodus according to the Hebrew text there is no mention of a covenant, but of a contract. For, the words of Exodus 24, □'"□T DDOV mm m2 ΊΜΚ mnn DT mn do not have any other meaning but this: *Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you in accordance with all these words.* Therefore, either Paul did not know the Hebrew language, or the author of this letter is not Paul.

I respond: either it is a question about the matter, or about a name. If it is about a name, Erasmus accuses this author unjustly; for, not only this author but also the 70 interpreters always translate the word nnn with διαθήκη, that is, *Testament,* as is clear from the Psalms which we have from the LXX version, and Jerome on Malachi 2, where he says that the LXX almost always translates the word as testament. And the Apostle Paul in Rom. 9, Gal. 3 and 4 and elsewhere when speaking about the Old Law always says "testament" for the Hebrew word ; indeed this word "testament" is used so commonly in the Church for the Hebrew mna that nothing is used more frequently nor do we hear more often than Old Testament and New Testament.

But if the question is not about the name, but about the reality, as if the author of this letter distorted the text of Exodus to call it a testament in the strict sense, where Exodus calls it a contract, then I respond in this way—that the promise of eternal life, which is treated under figures in the Old Testament and openly in the New Testament, is at the same time a testament and a contract: a testament, because it contains a disposition concerning the eternal inheritance to be given to the children of God, which was not ratified before the death of the testator. For, a testament or will is a disposition for an inheritance, which is not ratified before the testator dies, but the promise of God is at the same time a contract, because it has an annexed condition; for God the testator does not will to give an eternal inheritance except to those who observe his laws, and for this reason it is said to be an agreement or a contract. Therefore Moses is speaking about this same matter in Exod. 24 and Paul in Heb. 9, and Moses indeed calls it a testament, but he understands not just any kind of testament, but a contract about giving an inheritance after the death of the testator, and therefore he sprinkles blood on the people, which is a figure of the blood of Christ poured out for us. Paul calls it a testament, but he understands it to be not about any kind of testament, but a conditioned one, that is, one which is at the same time a contract.

CHAPTER XVIII

ON THE EPISTLES OF JAMES, JUDE, 2 PETER, 2 AND 3 JOHN

Concerning these epistles—that some authors formerly doubted whether or not they are apostolic is stated by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 25 of his History, and St. Jerome in his book on illustrious men in his treatment of James, Jude, Peter and John. Of recent authors, Luther in the prologues to these epistles, Brentius, Kemnitius and the Centuriatorians, in the places cited in the previous chapter, completely reject the letters of James and Jude; concerning the others they have some doubt, although Luther in his prologue to the epistle to the Hebrews places 2 Pet. among the canonical books. Erasmus in his notes to these epistles says that the epistle of James does not manifest apostolic gravity; he has doubts about 2 Pet.; on 2 and 3 John he says that they are not by John the Apostle, but by someone else; he says nothing about the epistle of Jude. Cajetan has doubts about the authors of the epistles of James, Jude, and 2 and 3 John, and therefore he thinks they have less authority than the others. Then Calvin accepts all of them and the Calvinists also in article 3 of the confession of Pissiacensis.

Now we are not allowed to think anything other than that these epistles are apostolic and divine. In the first place this is proved of all of them together, since they are placed in the catalogue under the names of the Apostles Peter, James, and Jude by the Council of Laodicea, Carthage III, Florence and Trent, as cited above; likewise by Innocent I in letter 3 to Exuperius and Gelasius in the council of the 70 Bishops. Moreover, they are approved also by Origen in homily 7 on Joshua, by Epiphanius on the heresies (76), by Athanasius in the synopsis, by Jerome in his letter to Paulinus on the study of Scripture, by Augustine in book 2, chapter 8 on Christian Doctrine, by Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed, by Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of the etymology, by Damascene in book 4, chapter 18. Next, we will treat each book separately. For, the council of Mileum quotes the epistle of James in order to prove a church dogma, Dionysius in chapter 4 On the Divine Names cites the same epistle, Cyprian in his book for Novatian, Augustine in letter 29 to Jerome, and others passim. Also it is read frequently in Church under the name of James the Apostle.

The second epistle of Peter is cited under the name of Peter by Higinius in letter 2, by St. Gregory in homily 18 on Ezekiel, and by others passim. Furthermore, either it must be admitted that this epistle is by Peter, or that it contains an intolerable error, which no one up until now has dared to say. For, in chapter 1 the author says: *We heard this voice... when* w *were with him on the holy mountain, etc.;* and certainly the only ones with the Lord on the holy mountain when he was transfigured were Peter, James and John, as the gospel says in Matt. 17. Therefore, the author of the epistle either was an outstanding imposter or he was one of the three leading Apostles of Christ. And although it makes little difference which one of the three it was in what concerns the authority of the epistle, still it is sufficiently certain that it was not James or John; both because no one has ever said this, and also because the author clearly at the beginning of the epistle calls himself Simon Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ. Bede, having been convinced by this argument,

in his commentary on the epistle wonders by what reason there could be any doubt about the author of this epistle.

The epistle of Jude is cited as being by Jude the Apostle by Dionysius in chapter 4 of the Divine Names, by Tertullian in the book on the clothing of women, by Cyprian in the book for Novation, and frequently by later authors. The same epistle is verified by Origen in book 5, chapter 5 on Romans, by Epiphanius on the heresies (76), and by Jerome on Titus 1, and by the catalogue of the scriptures.

The second epistle of John is cited by Cyprian in book 2, towards the end, of the decrees of the council of Carthage.

The third epistle of John is cited by Dionysius in Celestial Hierarchy (ch. 3).

But contrary arguments are not lacking. The first one is that of Erasmus against the epistle of James. If this epistle is by James, it will certainly be by the one who was the first Bishop of Jerusalem, and about whom so many things are said in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the letter to the Galatians, but that he was not really one of the twelve apostles is certain from Jerome in his commentary on Gal. 1, where he says that they are guilty of a serious error who say that this James is one of the twelve.

I respond that the argument of Erasmus clearly is based on a falsehood. For, Jerome does not say that those err who think that this James is one of the twelve, but that those who say this James is the brother of John, and the one whom Herod ordered to be beheaded. But the same Jerome teaches that this James is one of the twelve, and he proves it in his book against Helvidius with these words: *No one doubts that there were two apostles named James: James son of Zebedee and James son of Alphaeus: I know not which apostle you want to be the lesser James, who is the son of Mary, but not of Mary the mother of the Lord. If he is an apostle, he will be the son of Alphaeus; if he is not an apostle, but some third unknown James, how can he be thought to be the brother of the Lord? And how is the third one, as distinguished from the greater, called the less? Since major and minor normally mean a distance between two individuals, and not three. Also, the brother of the Lord is an apostle, and Paul said that he saw no other apostle except James, the brother of the Lord.* Moreover, this same point can be proved for many reasons, but because this is not necessary at this time and I am trying to be brief, I will say only this: If this James is not one of the twelve Apostles, this means that in the Church there is no remembrance of one of the twelve Apostles; for, it is certain from Matthew's Gospel that there were two with the name of James among the twelve: James the son of Zebedee and James the son of Alphaeus. But in the Church there is no commemoration except for James, the brother of John, on July 25, and of the James who wrote this epistle and was the first Bishop of Jerusalem on May 1. Therefore, if he is not James the son of Alphaeus, it follows that there is absolutely no remembrance of him, which is certainly supremely absurd.

The second argument. The author of this book does not use the usual salutation of the apostles, but speaks only in a profane way: *James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes in the dispersion, Greeting.* Therefore it is not probable that it is by James. I respond to this argument what Cajetan says about this text: If this salutation should be considered profane, then the one should be considered even more profane that

occurs in Acts 15: *The brethren, both the apostles and the elders, to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greeting;* but no Catholic would dare to criticize this salutation as profane. Therefore, neither should anyone criticize the salutation of James for being profane.

The third argument against the same epistle is that of the Magdeburgenses (in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 54), and it contains other following ones. Eusebius says in book 2, chapter 23 of his History that this letter, and also that of Jude, are not genuine; therefore they do not have solid authority. I respond that this is a lie, not an argument; for, here are the words of Eusebius in the place cited by the adversaries: *It is io be known,* he said, *that they are not accepted by some authors.* And then he adds: *But we know that also those letters, along with the others, have been accepted by almost all the Churches.*

The fourth argument. This letter deviates very much from the common doctrine of the apostles. For, in chapter two it attributes justification not to faith alone, but to works, since Paul says in Rom. 3 that man is justified by faith without works. I respond that with this argument the Lutherans confess that they are the children of those ancient heretics against whom that epistle had been written. For, listen to what Augustine writes in chapter 14 of his book on faith and works: *Wherefore,* he said, *let us see what must be driven out of religious hearts, lest they lose their salvation because of a false security, if they should think that in order to obtain it faith is sufficient, but they have neglected to live well and to persevere in the way of God with good works. For, also in the time of the Apostles, when some did not properly understand the somewhat obscure statements of the Apostle Paul, some thought that he said this, etc.* And further on he says: *Therefore since this opinion had arisen at that time, the other apostolic epistles of Peter, John, James and Jude especially direct their intention, in order to make a strong case that faith without works has no value; just as also Paul himself did not define just any kind of faith by which one believes in God, but that salutary and fully evangelical faith whose works proceed from love.*

But to this argument we respond with Augustine, in his preface to Psalm 32, that the Apostles did not fight among themselves. For, Paul is speaking about the first justification whereby a man becomes justified from having been unjustified, and under the notion of works he understands the works that take place without faith and grace by the powers alone of free choice; but James is speaking about the second justification, whereby someone from being just becomes more just, according to what is said in Rev. 22:11 : *Let the righteous still do right;* and by the word "works" he understands those works that are done with faith and the assistance of God's grace. For, just as a man cannot procreate himself, or raise himself from the dead, still after he is bom he can nourish and develop himself by his own work; so a sinner cannot make himself righteous, but he can, since he is justified, increase his righteousness by his own works. But this question will be handled more extensively in its proper place.

The fifth argument. This epistle says nothing about the work of Christ and the doctrine of the faith, and speaks only about works: but the apostles are wont always to include something about the doctrine of the faith; therefore this epistle is not apostolic. I

respond that the apostle James on purpose is dealing totally in commending works, as we demonstrated above from Augustine, because the evangelists and Paul had sufficiently explained the doctrine of faith; and those against whom he is writing were extolling the doctrine of faith too much and were neglecting good works. I also add, if this epistle is to be considered as not genuine, because almost all of it is dedicated to commending good works, the Proverbs also and the Ecclesiastes of Solomon must be thought to be not genuine books, since nothing is read in them except sermons on good morals; or, if Proverbs and Ecclesiastes are to be counted among the sacred books, and the adversaries agree with this, certainly there is no reason why we should reject the epistle of James which is very similar to those books.

The sixth argument. This author in chapters 1 and 2 says that the law of the Old Testament is the law of liberty; but the Apostle Paul calls it a law of slavery in Gal. 4; therefore both epistles cannot be apostolic. But it is certain that the letter to the Galatians is apostolic; therefore what is published under the name of James is not apostolic, but contrary to what is apostolic.

I respond that James is not speaking about the old law but about the new, since he calls it the law of freedom. But on this account James seemed to them to be speaking about the old law, because he mentions the precepts of the Decalogue, and they foolishly imagine that the new law does not contain any precepts, but only promises of grace and the preaching of faith. But there is no doubt that they are mistaken. Since the precepts of the Decalogue do not pertain any less to Christians than they do to Hebrews, as is known from Matt. 5 and from other texts; but there is this difference between the Old and the New Testaments, that the Old Testament imposed precepts but did not give the powers needed to fulfill them and therefore it was said to be and was a law of fear and slavery. On the other hand, the New Testament offers grace together with the laws whereby men are helped, and they can fulfill the precepts easily, freely and willingly; for this reason Christians are not said to be under the law, and for the just there is said to be no law, not because they do not have to observe it, but because the law does not oppress or lie heavy on them, and because they most willingly and freely observe it.

But let us listen to Augustine teaching the same things in his book on Nature and Grace, chapter 57: *If you are led by the Spirit,* he said, *you are no longer under the law, indeed a law that inculcates fear, that does not confer charity; this charity of God is diffused into our hearts, not through the letter of the law, but through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us. This is the law of freedom, not of slavery, because it is one of charity, not of fear. Concerning this the apostle James also says: He who looks into the perfect law, the law of liberty, etc.* And in commenting on Gal. 6 he said: *The same Scripture and the same command desiring earthly goods, the Old Testament weighs heavy on slaves, while what lifts up the free burning with desire for eternal goods—this is called the New Testament.* And in chapter 3 of his book on Continence he says: *We are not under the law, which commands one to do good, but does not give the power to do it, but we are under grace, which makes us love what the law commands and enables us to do it freely.*

The seventh argument. The author of this epistle presents testimonies from the epistles of Peter and Paul; therefore he was not an apostle himself, but a disciple of the

Apostles. I respond that no texts of Peter and Paul are cited in this epistle; and hence that the adversaries have been deceived, because they saw in the margin of the book outside the text of James that some passages of Peter and Paul were added. But we also see in the margins of the epistles of Paul that certain texts are noted from the epistles of Peter and of the other Apostles; and in the margins of 1 Pet. and 1 John many places in Paul are noted; but these epistles of Peter, Paul and John are not thereby placed in doubt. For, notations of this kind do not mean that one apostle is borrowing from another, but that similar ideas are found among the apostles, which the Holy Spirit produces in order to show that he is the one and same author of all of them. We see this same thing also in the prophets: for, Isaiah and Micah lived at the same time, since both of them at the beginning of their book mention that they wrote in the days of Joatham, and Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah, and nevertheless we find in Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 an outstanding prophecy about Christ, expressed not only with the same sentences, but also with the same words.

The eighth argument. The author of this epistle does not call himself an apostle of Christ, as Paul does; therefore he is not credible that he is an apostle, but he is a disciple of less importance.

I respond: if faith were to be put in such poor reasoning, then not only the epistle of James, but also several others of Paul and John would have to be rejected. Since Paul in his epistle to the Philippians, in both epistles to the Thessalonians, and in the one to Philemon, does not call himself an apostle of Christ, but either his servant, as James does, or he adds nothing; John also neither in his epistles nor in Revelation calls himself an apostle.

The same Magdeburgenses raise four arguments against the epistle of Jude. First, because he does not call himself an apostle, but we have already answered that objection.

Secondly, because Jude says that he lived after the Apostles, since he says: *You must remember, beloved, the predictions of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ 'who said to you that in the last time there will be scoffers, etc.,* clearly citing some things from the second epistle of Peter. I respond that Jude lived at the same time with the apostles, but he wrote his epistle after Peter and Paul, and therefore rightly could quote their letters. Similarly, Peter also in his second epistle mentions the letters of Paul, even though they lived at the same time and were crowned on the same day.

The third argument. Jude preached the gospel not in Greece, but in Persia. Therefore, if he wrote something, he would have written it in Persian, not in Greek. I respond that Jude, although he preached in Persia, nevertheless wrote his epistle not for the Persians, but for the Jews dispersed throughout the world; Peter and Paul also wrote to them. Therefore he rightly wanted to write in Greek, which was then the most common language. Moreover, who does not see how inept this argument is: Jude preached in Persia, therefore he had to write in Persian? For, if that argument had any value, for the same reason we would conclude that Peter, who taught in Rome and from there wrote two letters, should have written in Latin rather than in Greek; and Matthew, who preached in Ethiopia, should have written his Gospel in the Ethiopian language; Paul also, who preached in Italy, when he wrote to Timothy, to Philemon and to the Hebrews should have written in Latin, not in Greek or Hebrew.

The fourth argument. Jude recounts the history of the altercation between Michael the Archangel and the Devil over the body of Moses, and a prophecy of Enoch. But none of this is read in the canonical Scriptures; therefore this epistle should be numbered among the Apocrypha. I respond: although Tertullian in his book on the clothing of women contends that the book of Enoch is canonical, and Bede says about this epistle that in Jude's time the book of Enoch was a true and canonical book in the hands of men, still now it does not exist; nevertheless it seems more probable that the book is apocryphal. Moreover, as Jerome on Titus 1 and Augustine in book 15, chapter 3 of *The City of God,* and in book 18, chapter 38, say that there is also something true in the Apocrypha, and that Jude made use of this, but because of that he did not approve the whole book; as Paul also in Acts 17, in 1 Cor. 15 and in Tit. 1 borrows testimony from the pagan poets Aratus, Menander and Epimenides; still that does not mean that he consecrated those poets.

But Jude, Cajetan said, cites the book of Enoch not as apocryphal, but as prophetic. I respond with Augustine in book 15, chapter 23 in *The City of GodXhaX* without doubt it must be believed that Enoch wrote something prophetic and divine, and that his prophecy was inserted in the book that Jude cites; but that the book was apocryphal for the reason that it contained many uncertain and fabled things along with this true prophecy that Jude cites.

Against the second letter of Peter only a diversity of style from the first letter is objected, which certainly was written by Peter. This objection comes from Erasmus, with whom the Magdeburgenses disagree considerably, since they write that it seems to them that the style of 2 Pet. is veiy much like that of 1 Pet. St. Jerome responds to this in question of 11 to Hedibia that the diversity of style, if there is any, comes from the diversity of the translators, for Peter did not always use the same translator.

Against 2 and 3 John the objectors base their case on the authority of Papias as found in Eusebius in book 3, chapter 39 of his History, and Jerome in his essay on John is his book on the famous men. For, Papias says that there were two Johns—one the apostle, and the other who is called the elder; and since the author of these epistles does not call himself an apostle, but an elder, it seems to be probable that these two short epistles by John the elder were not written by John the apostle. But this conjecture has less weight than what must be opposed to it, namely, the authority of so many councils, Pontiffs and Fathers, who attribute these epistles to the apostle John. This is so especially because Papias did not say that these epistles are not by the apostle John (for he only mentions two Johns, but he does not say which one wrote the epistles), and the apostle John rightly can be called an elder, since he lived after all the apostles until he attained great old age. In addition, St. Jerome had no doubts about these epistles, so that while being about to cite them in his letter 85 to Evagrius, he begins in this way: *The evangelical trumpet sounds, the son of thunder, whom Jesus loved very much, who drank the flowing water of doctrine from the side of the Savior.*

CHAPTER XIX

ON THE APOCALYPSE

Among the ancient heretics the Marcionists rejected the Apocalypse of John, according to Tertullian in book four against Marcion, and also Alogianus and Theodotian, according to Epiphanius in his book on heresies (51 and 54). Among the recent heretics, Luther in his prologue says that he desires something in it, since the Apocalypse says that they would be blessed who observe what has been written, but that no one understands what those things are. However, in his earlier preface to the New Testament he says that he does not accept the Apocalypse either as a prophetic or apostolic book, but judges it to be like the book of Esdras. Brentius and Kemnitius, in the places already noted, agree with Luther. But the Magdeburgenses (Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 56) abandon Luther and join Calvin, and with him they fight strongly for the Apocalypse against other Lutherans. Erasmus at the end of his notes on the Apocalypse anxiously raises various conjectures whereby he proves that this book is not by the apostle John.

Formerly there were not lacking Catholics who had doubts about the authority and the author of this book. For, a certain Caius, an ancient author, said that this book was by the heretic Cerinthus, according to Eusebius in book 7, chapter 23 of his History. But Dionysius of Alexandria as found in book 7, chapter 23 of Eusebius, while refuting this opinion of Caius says that this book is divine and canonical, but he has doubts whether it is by the apostle John or by some other John. Finally, St. Jerome in a letter to Dardanus testifies that just as the Greeks had doubts about the Apocalypse, contrary to the general agreement of the Latins, so the Latins had doubts about the epistle to the Hebrews, contrary to the general opinion of the Greeks.

Nevertheless we can easily prove that the Apocalypse both was written by the apostle John and is an admirable and divine book. First, from the councils: for, at the council of Ancyra more than 1200 years ago, in the last canon the book is cited under the name of John; at Carthage III (canon 47) and in the Roman council under Gelasius I it is numbered among the sacred and canonical books. Likewise, at the council of Toledo IV in canon 16 it is confirmed by the sanction of many councils and Pontiffs that the Apocalypse is by the apostle John and that it is truly canonical and divine.

Next, the same point can be proved from the Greek and Latin Fathers. For, Dionysius in chapter 3 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy calls the Apocalypse the secret and mystical vision of the beloved disciple. Justin in his dialogue with Trypho, near the middle, says that the Apocalypse is by the apostle John, and he illustrates that point with his commentaries, as St. Jerome bears witness in his essay on John in his book of famous men. Irenaeus in book 5 near the end says that the Apocalypse is by the apostle John and was written in the first century at the end of the reign of Domitian; he also published some commentaries on the same, according to Jerome in his book on famous men. Theophilus of Antioch, Melito of Sarda, and Dionysius of Alexandria, ancient and learned Greek Bishops, accepted the Apocalypse as divinely written, according to Eusebius in book 4, chapters 24 and 26, and in book 7, chapter 23. Clement of

Alexandria in book 2, chapter 12 of his Pedagogy cites the Apocalypse. Origen in homily 7 on Joshua, and on Psalm 1, attributes the Apocalypse to the apostle John, and Eusebius does the same in his Chronicle of the year of the Lord 96. Chrysostom in homily 3 on Psalm 92 and Damascene in book 4, chapter 18, recognize the Apocalypse as sacred and as by John. Wherefore it is necessary that the Greeks who, according to Jerome, did not accept the Apocalypse, were few and not well known.

Finally, it is proved from the general agreement of the Latins. For, Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion says that the Apocalypse is by the apostle John. Cyprian in his exhortation to the martyrs (chapters 3, 8, 10, 11, 12) cites the Apocalypse passim as he does the other divine scriptures; Hilary also does the same in his preface to the Psalms. Ambrose on Psalms 41 says that the Apocalypse is by John the evangelist. St. Augustine in treatise 36 on John says that the Apocalypse is by the same John who wrote the Gospel, and book 2, chapter 8 of his Christian Doctrine he places it among the sacred and divine books; Innocent I does the same in his letter 3 to Exuperius; Rufinus in his explanation of the Creed; and Isidore in book 6, chapter 1 of his Etymology. St. Jerome not only in his letter to Paulinus on the study of the Scriptures teaches that the Apocalypse is by John, but he says it is the opinion of all the Latin authors in his letter to Dardanus on the promised land. Finally, Sulpicius in book 2 of his sacred history says that the Apocalypse has not been accepted by some in a way that is either stupid or impious.

But to the argument of Luther, who tries to prove that the Apocalypse does not have equal authority with the rest of the sacred books, because in the first and last chapters of the book it says: *Blessed is he 'who keeps the 'words of the prophecy of this book,* since no one knows what this prophecy means, I respond: although there are many very obscure prophecies in this book, nevertheless many are also clear precepts of life, as on constancy in persecution, on having hatred for heretics, on avoiding false prophets, etc.; the argument and purpose of the whole book is nothing other than to exhort us to perseverance and patience at the time of persecutions. Indeed this point is very clear and evident.

But now let us see what Erasmus has to say. He objects. First, he says that there are some authors who do not mention this book, like Dorotheus and Anastasius, and those who doubt whether it is by the apostle John, like Dionysius and Eusebius. Secondly, that passim he mentions his own name when he says: *I John, I John; in a like manner,* he says, *as if he were writing a contract, not a book, since elsewhere more modestly in his narration he never mentions his own name in the Gospel,* Lastly, he says that in the Greek codices the title is not by John the apostle but by John the theologian.

But these are trivial points. For, in contrast to the two authors who do not mention this book, and the two who have doubts about the author, we have cited four councils and several Fathers, who constantly attribute this book to the apostle John. Although Eusebius, whom Erasmus counts among the doubters, openly declares in the Chronicle that he has not had absolutely any doubts about the author or the authority of this book. In the second objection we rightly desire some modesty from Erasmus, who dares to accuse the author of this book to be guilty of arrogance, whom the whole Church has

always venerated as very holy. Nor is it true that the *I John* in this book is repeated so often, since at most it is found only two or three times in the whole book. And this is not something new in the prophets, that they often repeat their names, since certainly at least eight times Daniel says *I Daniel.* Finally, there is nothing contrary to our judgment in the fact that the author of the Apocalypse is called "John the Theologian." For, there is no other John, who had the title of "theologian" except the apostle and evangelist John, and rightly so; for, as Augustine says in treatise 36 on John, the reason why John is compared to a high-flying eagle, but the other evangelists to animals crawling on the earth, is because the others wrote about the humanity of Christ, but he especially about his divinity. Wherefore Dennis the Areopagite in his epistle on John the apostle calls him the theologian and apostle; and Athanasius in the Synopsis and other ancients call him the theologian.

CHAPTER XX

ON THE APOCRYPHAL BOOKS

NOW after having explained the canon of the sacred books and having defended them briefly against the argument of the adversaries, it remains for us to say a few things about the books which, although to some have seemed to be canonical, still rightly and deservedly are judged to be not canonical, but apocryphal.

Thus the word *apocryphal* is Greek, and signifies something hidden and secret. This is because ἀποκρύπτειν means *to hide,* and ἀποκρυφή means *a hiding place.* Further, ecclesiastical writers do not always use this word in the same way. For sometimes they call scriptures those Apocrypha concerning which it is not certain whether they are canonical and divine, even if it is sufficiently certain that no errors can be found in them. Thus Jerome says in his prologue to Galatians that all those books that are not in the canon should be numbered among the Apocrypha. But sometimes they call apocryphal books those that contain errors. In this way Origen uses the word in homily 1 on the Canticle; Jerome in his letter to Laeta on the instruction of her children, and Augustine in book 15, chapter 23 in *The City of God.* Gelasius in the decree on ecclesiastical books uses this meaning, and he calls those books apocryphal that have been published by heretical authors, or are certainly suspect.

But what the gloss on the Holy Roman canon (distinction 15) says, namely, that those books are to be called apocryphal whose author is not known, is not probable; for then many sacred books would be apocryphal, like the books of Judith, Ruth, Job, 1 Maccabees, and several others, whose authors are not known—and this is far removed from the way the Church speaks. For who ever heard that a canonical book is apocryphal?

Several apocryphal books are mentioned by Gelasius, as is given in distinction 15 of the Holy Roman canon, by Innocent I in letter 3, by Athanasius in the Synopsis, and by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 15 of his History, but for the most part they no longer exist. The ones that exist are these: the prayer of king Manasseh, which is usually attached to the books of Chronicles, and which therefore is apocryphal, or we do not seem to be able to say with certainty that it is canonical, because it is not part of a canonical book, nor is it placed by name in the canon by any council, or Pontiff, or Father cited above; nor is it given in Hebrew or Greek, but only in the Latin edition. Also apocryphal is Psalm 151 of David, which Athanasius mentions in the Synopsis, and it is found in the Greek Psalters. I call this Psalm apocryphal, because the council of Laodicea in canon 59, the council of Rome under Gelasius, and Trent in session 4 place by name in the canon only 150 Psalms.

Likewise apocryphal is the appendix of the book of Job, which is contained only in the Greek codices. For, the Council of Trent in session 4 said that only those books are canonical that are contained in the Latin Vulgate edition. Moreover, St. Jerome in his study of Genesis shows that what is contained in that appendix is false, namely, that Job was a descendant of Esau, since he belonged to the offspring of Hus, who was the son of Nahor, Abraham's brother, as is said in Genesis 22. You can add to this, that that appendix

is based mainly on the authority of Gen. 36, where Jobab is named among the descendants of Esau; but very different is the name arx which is the proper name of Job, in contrast to 2DV which is given in Gen. 36. The short preface also seems to be apocryphal, which is placed before the Lamentations of Jeremiah; for, it is not in the Hebrew codices, nor in all the Latin codices, and it is not mentioned by the commentators.

The book of Hermas, who is said to be the Shepherd, must be considered no less apocryphal. For, although Origen (in book 10 on the epistle to the Romans) thought that it was divinely inspired, and testimony was drawn from it by Tertullian in his book on prayer, Irenaeus in book 4, chapter 37, Clement of Alexandria in book 6 of the Stromata, Athanasius in his book on the decrees of the Council of Nicaea, Cassian in coll. 15, chapter 12, and Eusebius in book 3, chapter 3 of his Histoiy judged the same book to be useful, Rufinus on the Creed, and Jerome in his book on ecclesiastical authors concerning Hermas, nevertheless it has not been placed in the canon by any Synod; and with eloquent words Gelasius rejected it from the canon in the decree on ecclesiastical books; and Athanasius in the Synopsis and also in his book on the decrees of the Council of Nicaea, and Theodoretus in book 1, chapter 18 of his history say that the Arians, who were seeking testimonies from this book, were seeking testimonies from a non-canonical book.

Finally, the third and fourth books of Maccabees are apocryphal, and also the third and fourth books of Esdras. In fact, concerning 4 Macc. the matter is very clear, since it is mentioned only by Athanasius in the Synopsis and he places it outside the canon. But 4 Esdras is cited by Ambrose in the book on a good death, in book 2 on Luke, and in letter 21 to Horatianus; however, without doubt it is not canonical, since it is not placed in the canon by any council, and it is not found either in Hebrew or in Greek, and finally in chapter 6 it contains some fables about the fish of Enoch and Leviathan, which the seas could not contain, and which were the inventions of the Rabbis of the Talmud. Hence it is amazing what entered into the mind of Genebrardus, namely, that he wanted to place this book also in the canon (see his Chronology, page 90).

But there is a greater difficulty concerning the third book of Maccabees, since Clement in the apostolic canon (canon 84) places the three books of Maccabees in the canon. And there is no less of a difficulty with book 3 of Esdras; for, in the Greek codices it is called the first book of Esdras, and what among us are called first and second Esdras, in Greek are called second Esdras. Therefore it is probable that the ancient Fathers and councils, when they place the two books of Esdras in the canon, understood under the name of the two books, all three of them. For they followed the Septuagint version of the translators, among whom our three are called the two books of Esdras. There is also the added fact that this third book of Esdras is cited by Athanasius in his third oration against the Arians, by Augustine in book 18, chapter 36 of *The City of God,* by Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of the Stromata, and by St. Cyprian in his letter to Pompey.

Concerning the first difficulty, it seems probable that that canon is not from Clement. For, Zephyrinus, the fifteenth Pope after Peter, in letter 1 says that there were only seventy canons of the Apostles, or as the other codices say there were sixty. Humbertus in his book against Nicetus acknowledges only fifty, but the one mentioned is the eighty-

fourth. And certainly Zephyrinus knew better how many canons of the Apostles there are than anyone living after him. Therefore not without reason Gelasius, in distinction 15 of the Holy Roman canons, placed the canons of the Apostles among the Apocrypha, which he seems to have done because of some which had been either altered or added by the heretics. There is no opposition to this in the fact that in the canons, which are said to come from the sixth synod, in the second canon the 85 canons of the Apostles are approved; for, those canons do not really come from the sixth synod, but they come from another council celebrated later, which the Sovereign Pontiff Sergius, who was Pope at that time, not only did not approve, but also rebuked, as is clear from Bede in his book on the six ages under Justinian.

Then in that canon 84 the canonical books are listed, and certain ones are omitted which certainly are canonical, like the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Apocalypse, and this seems to be a matter of no little importance. For, the Church, which existed after the Apostles, did not learn from any other source which books are canonical and which are not except from the tradition of the apostles. In addition, there is testimony that Clement adhered exactly to the apostolic traditions, because he had lived for a long time with the apostles Peter and Paul; this is affirmed by Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 3, and by Eusebius in book 5, chapter 6 of his History. Therefore the books not placed in the canon by Clement are seen absolutely to be non-canonical. Therefore either the books of Esdras, Tobit, Judith, Apocalypse are not canonical, or that decree is not from Clement. What some say is that the Apocalypse was omitted by Clement because it had not yet been written at that time, but this is a point they cannot prove. For, John wrote the Apocalypse at the end of the reign of Domitian. As Irenaeus says at the end of book 5; but Clement died in the third year of Trajan, as Jerome says in his book on famous men. Therefore Clement could have seen the Apocalypse.

Next, is not the Gospel of John placed in this eighty-fourth canon? But many learned authors testify that the Apocalypse was written before the Gospel. Eusebius in book 3, chapter 24 of his History said: *The tradition is that John until almost the end of his life preached the gospel without any indication of a written Scripture.* Athanasius says in the Synopsis: *The Gospel according to John was preached by John, the apostle and beloved disciple, when he was in exile on the island of Patmos, and afterwards it was published by him at Ephesus.* Epiphanius (see Heresies 51) writes in an eloquent way that the Gospel was published by John after his 90th year of life, and after his return from Patmos.

Theophylact, Euthymius, Bede and Rupert in the preface of his commentaiy on John by common consent teach that the Gospel of John was written and published either in Patmos or after his return from Patmos. And there is no contradiction to this in what Dionysius the Areopagite writes in his letter about John living in exile: for, Dionysius calls John the sun of the gospel, and his heavenly theologian, not because of some writing, which then existed under the name of John, but because of his divine and wonderful preaching.

Furthermore, in that same canon 84, numbered among the sacred books are not only the third book of Maccabees, but also the two letters of Clement, and the Apostolic Constitutions by the same Clement; but the Church has never recognized these books as

sacred. And if that canon really came from Clement, the Church could not, without great temerity, not accept these books, since Clement was the Sovereign Pontiff, and either he himself established the canons of the Apostles, or, what is more likely, commended the canons already established by apostolic letters. However, the Church is not allowed to reject apostolic, or even pontifical laws, unless it concerns customs and rules proper to that time and it is certain that they have now been abrogated; an example of this is the regulation to abstain from blood and what is strangled.

To the other difficulty I respond: although in the Greek codices the two books of Esdras are our three, nevertheless not on that account did the ancient councils and the old Fathers, who put the two books of Esdras in the canon, understand under the name of two, our three books. For, many of the ancients, like Melito, Epiphanius, Hilary, Jerome, Ruffinus, while explaining the canon of the Old Testament, openly followed the Hebrews, not the Greeks. But the Hebrews do not have the third book of Esdras. Hence nothing from this third book is ever read in the Divine Office. This is an argument that already for a long time this book was not included in the number of the sacred books. Moreover, Gelasius in the Roman council of the 70 bishops places in the canon only one book of Esdras. Doubtless by this one he understands our two, which, as Jerome testifies in his preface to Esdras, are contained in one volume. Therefore, with clear words Gelasius rejects the prior one, which is the Greek one.

Finally, St. Jerome in his preface to Esdras clearly says that the third and fourth books of Esdras not only do not exist among the Hebrews, but they are not even in the Septuagint. Wherefore, although some Greek codices had the three volumes of Esdras in two books, still they did not have the more correct ones. In addition, the ancient Fathers sometimes use testimonies taken from this book, which even we confess is not useless, but they do it rarely and they never say that it is sacred and divine.

BOOK TWO

On the Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and common Latin versions

CHAPTER I

IT IS SHOWN THAT THE HEBREW EDITION OF MOSES AND THE PROPHETS NEVER PERISHED

In the previous book we treated the sacred books so that we might vindicate their number and authority against the calumnies of the heretics. The next step is to examine briefly the various editions of the same books, that is, the Hebrew, Latin, German, French, and similar editions, which are common or local. For, it would not be very helpful to know the number of the divine books, if we do not know to which edition authority should be attributed of the many different editions that now exist.

Therefore, since we begin with the Hebrew edition, there are two questions that have to be answered. One, whether the Scripture that was written by Moses and the prophets has been handed down to us. The other is, whether the Scripture which is contained in the Hebrew codices, by the perverse zeal of the Jews, has been so corrupted and distorted that it merits no authority in the Church.

There are two opinions about the first question. One is that of those who teach that the entire sacred Scripture perished at the time of the Babylonian captivity, when the city was destroyed and the temple was consumed by fire, and afterwards it was restored again by Ezra, because the Holy Spirit dictated everything to him just as it was before. Basil seems to adopt this view in his letter to Chilo: *This is the place,* he said, *where, after the captivity, Ezra by the command of God wrote down all the divine books.* This is what he said. They quote also as sharing the same opinion, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria, but they do not teach this openly.

This opinion seems to us to be improbable. For, it does not rest on any other foundation than the testimony of an apocryphal book, namely, book 5, chapter 4 of Esdras, where in colorful language it is said that Esdras, for the whole period of forty days, being inspired by the divine Spirit, dictated to five men, who with great speed wrote down what was said by him, and in that way the whole Scripture, which had been completely lost, was restored. But this book not only is apocryphal, and never accepted by the Catholic Church, but in many places it is full of Jewish fables; in this same chapter 14 it speaks no differently about certain occult and more perfect books, which all the Talmudists fashion concerning their cabala. Therefore the testimony of this book does more to detract faith in this opinion than it does to add to it; and nothing like this is found in the canonical books.

But what some say, that it can be gathered from Nehemiah 8, is so far from the truth that rather the opposite can be concluded from it. For thus we have: *And they told Ezra the scribe to bring the book of the law of Moses... And Ezra the priest brought the law, etc.;* now these words do not say that he wrote the book of the law again, but that

he brought it out, because they knew it could still be found. Furthermore, although the Scripture that was used publicly in the temple was burned and so perished, nevertheless it is incredible that there were not also other copies, or certainly parts of them in the possession of private individuals, and especially with Ezekiel, Daniel, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, Mardochai, and Ezra himself, who were living then and who without doubt took care to preserve the law of the Lord.

Therefore there is another opinion that Ezra was the restorer of the sacred books, not by again dictating all of them, but by gathering them together and arranging the Scriptures into one body, whose parts he had found in various places, and also by correcting them if some were corrupted by the negligence of the scribes, since the Jews did not have a temple or tabernacle.

Some important authors seem to have had this view. For, Chiysostom in his homily 8 on the letter to the Hebrews teaches that Ezra composed it again from the remnants of the Scriptures. Hilary in his preface to the Psalms says that Ezra gathered together all the Psalms, and made one book out of them. Theodoretus in his preface to the Psalms says that the old Scripture was corrupted during the time of the captivity and was restored by Ezra. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 25, Tertullian in his book on the clothing of women, and Clement in book 1 of the Stromata seem to me to say the same thing. For, they say that Ezra reviewed and restored all the books of the Old Testament, and they do not mention the history of this which is given in in 4 Esdras.

St. Jerome in the prologue to Galatians says Ezra found new Hebrew writings, and that he gave the ancient ones to the Samaritans, but the new ones to the Jews, which are the ones we now use. For, as the same Jerome says on chapter 9 of Ezekiel, the last letter of the ancient Hebrew alphabet looked like the T of the Greeks, and it had the figure of a cross, since the end of the law is Christ crucified. Now the last letter does not seem to have any similarity to a cross. Therefore doubtless we have the new letters. However, Jerome says nothing about the new edition of the sacred books made by Ezra, although it would have been an ideal place to mention it.

Finally, if Ezra had dictated the sacred books again, it is probable that he would have done it not in the Hebrew language, but in Chaldean, or in a mixture of Hebrew and Chaldean, which was then in use, and in which we see that the books of Ezra and Daniel were written. But it is certain that all the sacred books, besides those of Ezra and Daniel, were written in Hebrew—that very language which Adam and Eve and all the prophets spoke. This is easily deduced from the etymology of the proper names, which often is not found in any other language.

Now we will cite a few examples from the many available. Adam said about his wife a short time after her creation: *she shall be called Woman,* in Hebrew nwx *because she was taken out of Man,* who in Hebrew is called W'K in Genesis 2. But in no other language do man and woman have this similarity of name. For, in the Chaldean language, which has affinity with Hebrew, a man is called and woman is called κηπl» and the two names do not have one common letter of the alphabet. Likewise, the Greek words άνήρ and γυνή, and the Latin *vir* and *mulier* have no literary similarity with each other. Therefore, either Adam did not say those words we quoted above, and the best of the

prophets lied, or we must admit that the divine books were written in that language which the first men used. Similar are the things said in the Scriptures about the reason for the names of Eve, Cain, Abel, Seth. Noah, Peleg, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and of all their sons; and also the names of the mountains, rivers, cities, and of many other things, since in the Hebrew language always those allusions are found in similar words; in other languages they are not found, or are found only rarely.

Finally, both the brevity and simplicity of the language, and the authority of very learned men bear witness to the fact that the Hebrew language, in which we see that the sacred books were written, is most ancient and therefore the first of all the languages. See Eusebius in book 10, chapter 3 on preparation for the Gospel, Ambrose on chapter 3 of Philippians, Jerome in his letter to Damasus on the vision of Isaiah, and Augustine in book 16, chapter 11 of *The City of God.* And what Augustine says in book 16, chapter 43 in *The City of God* does not contradict this, namely, that the Hebrew language was invented after the time of Noah. For, by this Augustine does not mean to say that the Hebrew language previously did not exist, but only that now for the first time it began to be called the Hebrew language. For, as Eucharius rightly explains regarding chapter 11 of Genesis—before the multiplication of languages the Hebrew language was common to all men, and so it did not have a definite name; but at the time of Heber, when many languages began to exist, that common language, as distinct from all the others, was called Hebrew, because it remained in the house of Heber, hence they are called Hebrews.

Therefore since it is clear that the books of Esdras are full of Chaldean words, but that the books of the law and of the prophets were written in the pure Hebrew language, it must also be clear that we have the books of the law and the prophets that were written not by Esdras, but by Moses and the ancient prophets.

CHAPTER II

WHETHER THE HEBREW EDITION HAS BEEN CORRUPTED

It follows now that there is another question: whether the Hebrew edition is integral or corrupt and vitiated. And first of all, the contemporary heretics, burning with hate for the Vulgate edition, place too much trust in the Hebrew edition. For, Calvin in his Antidote to the Council of Trent, and also Kemnitius in his examination of the same council, and Georgius Major in his preface to the Psalms want to examine and correct everything according to the Hebrew text, which more than once they call the purest font.

This opinion most clearly is false. For, first of all, Calvin in book 6 § 11 of his Institutes contends that Isaiah 9:6 should be read, *and his name will be called Wonderful Counselor, etc.,* but the Hebrew text does not have *it will be called,* that is xnp', but *he will call* Kip' ; and Calvin was not ignorant of the fact that the Vulgate edition in this place is better than the Hebrew. For he says this: *It is not as the Jews say and so invert the reading, this is the name which God gave to him: Mighty God, Everlasting Father, and finally they make this one remaining for the Son, that he be the Prince of Peace; for to what purpose would so many epithets for God be heaped together in this place?* Therefore by the admission of Calvin, that turbid fountain flows somewhere, which he himself wanted to be seen everywhere as pure. For a similar reasons in the same place Calvin wants Jeremiah 23:6 to be read: *and this is the name by which he will be called—the Lord is our righteousness.* But the Hebrew source constantly has ΊΚΊΡ' *he will call him,* not ΊΠΚΊΡ' *they will call him.*

Furthermore, in Psalm 22 there is no one who does not read: *They have pierced my hands and my feet:* but the Hebrew texts read, *like a* lion 'HKD *they did not pierce,* which is stated as TO: likewise, in Ps. 19:4 the Hebrew codices have: *their voice goes out through all the earth* Dip, that is, a *line, or their perpendicular;* however the LXX translate it as φθόγγος άυτών and St. Paul approves their translation in Rom. 10 where he cites this Psalm. And what about this—that Jerome literally renders the Hebrew *their voice goes out?* so that it is absolutely necessary, either to reprehend Paul and Jerome, or to confess certainly that the fount in this place is not pure. However, it is probable that it should be read o^ρ, for only one letter is added, so that from Dip it becomes o^Iρ. You can add to this that sometimes whole sentences are lacking in the Hebrew, since they are present in the Septuagint (LXX) and in Jerome's translation. We have an example of this in Exod. 2 where this whole sentence is lacking: *He also generated another son and called his name Eliazer, saying, the God of my father has helped me, and liberated me from the hand of Pharaoh.*

Therefore since these words are missing, they falsely attribute too much purity to the Hebrew source. It also seems to have occurred to others who, indeed with proper zeal but perhaps with a certain ignorance, firmly contend that the Jews, out of hatred for the Christian faith, have deliberately distorted and corrupted many texts of the Scriptures. This is taught by Bishop James in his preface to the Psalms, and by Melchior Cano in book 2, chapter 13 in his *Theological Sources.*

However, there are serious arguments against this opinion. First of all, that is the argument of Origen in his book 8 on Isaiah, as Jerome mentions in comments on Isa. 8, and the argument of Jerome in the same place whose reasoning goes like this: If the Hebrews at some time corrupted the Scriptures, either they did it before the coming of Christ, or afterwards. If before, why did Christ and the Apostles never reprehend them for such a heinous crime, especially since they were not silent about their smaller crimes? Why does the Lord say in John 5:39: *You search the Scriptures;* and in Matt. 23:2: *The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses "seat; so practice and observe whatever they tell you?* Who will believe that Christ invited men to read corrupted Scriptures without any warning; or, urged them to listen to and follow the corrupters of Scripture? However, if it took place after the coming of Christ, how can it be that the testimonies which are cited by Christ and the Apostles, almost all now are found in Moses and the prophets, so that they could be cited by them? Did they perhaps utter them in such a way that through the Spirit they knew that later they would be corrupted by the Jews? Therefore if neither before nor after the coming of the Savior the sacred writings were corrupted by the Hebrews, then it certainly follows that they were never corrupted. And this is the argument of Jerome and Origen.

Another argument is that of St. Augustine in book 15, chapter 13 of *The City oj God,* who proves that it does not seem in any way to be credible that the Jews wanted to take the truth away from their codices in order to deprive us of their authority; and even if they wanted to do that, it is not probable that they could have done it. But let us listen to his own words: *If Task them which of the two is more credible, that the Jewish nation, scattered far and wide, could have unanimously conspired to forge this lie, and so, through envying others the authority of their Scriptures, have deprived themselves oj their verity; or that seventy men, who were also themselves Jews, shut up in one place (for Ptolemy king of Egypt had got them together for this work), should have envied foreign nations that same truth, and by common consent inserted these errors: who does not see which can be more naturally and readily believed? But far be it from any prudent man to believe either that the Jews, however malicious and wrong-headed, could have tampered with so many and so widely dispersed manuscripts; or that those renowned seventy individuals had any common purpose to grudge the truth to the nations.* That is what Augustine says.

Someone will say that the general distortion of the Hebrew codices happened after the time of Augustine and Jerome; therefore their testimony does not apply to the present situation. But the reasons given by Augustine are valid at any time. Also, if that distortion happened after the time of those fathers, what reason can be given why Jerome's interpretation of the Psalms is so much in agreement in every way with the Hebrew text that now exists? And still there are some major complaints about the distortion of the Psalms. Did Jerome translate them exactly as the Jews were going to falsify them? The place in Ps. 22 is not opposed to this, where Jerome translates, *they pierced.* For, in the Masoretic text, which they wrote after the time of Jerome, the Rabbis say that in Psalm 22 it should be written כארי and not ארי from which it is evidently concluded that because of a scribal error it is now to be read as **OKD.**

The third argument can be taken from the incredible devotion of the Jews towards the sacred books. Philo writes in his book on the exodus of the children of Israel from Egypt, and it is quoted also by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 2 of his preparation for the Gospel, that, at their time after more than two thousand years, not even one word had ever been changed in the law of the Hebrews, and that any Jew would rather die a hundred time than to allow the law to be changed in any way. But on the fanaticism of more recent Jews, who worship the law almost like a god, and if it should happen to fall on the ground they prescribe a public fast, see John Isaac in response to the books of Lindanus on the best way of interpreting the Scriptures.

The fourth argument: If the Jews had wished to falsify the divine Scriptures out of hatred of Christians, doubtless they would have removed the principal prophecies. But they have not done that, since the things in which the Hebrew texts disagree with the Greek and Latin are often of no importance regarding what pertains to faith and religion, and sometimes the Hebrew codices vex the Jews more than they do the Greeks and Latins. Certainly in Psalm 2:11 the Latin and Greek have: *Serve the Lord with fear... for his wrath is quickly kindled;* nothing clearly against the Jews can be deduced; but in Hebrew it is, *You will kiss the Son lest his wrath be kindled,* that is, *show reverence to the Son of God lest his wrath be kindled etc.,* and this text is unanswerable against the Jews. So will it be credible that the Jews changed the Scripture so that it may in a better way give testimony to the Son of God? Likewise in Isa. 53:4 where we have: *And we esteemed him stricken, smitten be God and afflicted;* in Hebrew it can be read, *a smitten and afflicted God,* TWDO ΠЗΠ which certainly would be a major point for the Jews, who did not believe that the Messiah would be God.

The fifth and final argument is taken from the providence by which God always provides for his Church. For, it is not probable that God would allow it to happen that the words of so many illustrious prophets generally would be falsified, especially since for this purpose he dispersed the Jews throughout the whole world, and he wanted them to bring with themselves the books of the law and the prophets, so that our enemies would offer testimony to the Christian truth. St. Justin pointed this out in his hortatory oration, and St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 15 of *The City of God,* and from Psalm 59:11 it is manifestly deduced: *Do not kill them, do not forget my people and disperse them in your power, etc.* Therefore for this reason the Jews were dispersed and brought the sacred books with them, so that when the pagans do not believe the things which we say have been predicted about Christ, but prophecies of this kind invented by us, we may send them to our enemies, the Jews, who bring the prophecies with them.

But they raise objections to this. First, the testimony of the Fathers, like Justin in the dialogue with Trypho, Eusebius in book 4, chapter 18 of his History, Origen in homily 12 on Jeremiah, Chrysostom in homily 5 on Matthew, and Jerome in letter 89 to Augustine; in Micah 5 and in Galatians 3, who suspect that the Jews erased some things from the Hebrew codices, and corrupted some things out of hatred of the Christians.

I respond that Justin and Eusebius nowhere have written that the Hebrew text was corrupted by the Jews, but the Greek text of the LXX translators. Here are the words of Justin in the dialogue with Trypho: *And I want you to know that they took many*

complete texts from the translation of those who of the seniors were with Ptolemy, which it is shown clearly that this crucified one is God and man, and it is foretold th he would hang on a cross and die. These are the words of Justin. And he does not wri anything anywhere else about the corruption of the Hebrew text. Eusebius does not sî anything other than what was demonstrated by Justin for Trypho, namely, that his elde had removed some sections from the Scriptures. This is to be understood in the same wj as Justin explained it.

Origen also speaks openly about the corruption of the LXX version; for, he says th the word *Judah* was removed by the Jews in the Septuagint from the verse in Jeremie 17:1, *The sin of Judah is written with a pen of iron;* and they replaced it with, *Their s\ is written with a pen of iron.* For Origen speaks in this manner: *Then another prophet follows, which I know not why we do not find it in the LXX, and we do find it in the othe editions, which agree with the Hebrew version.* And after that he says: *The Jews,* w/i *falsified some of the copies, also in this place for the sin of Judah, replaced it with "the, sin."* Jerome, in his comments on this text in Jeremiah, also mentions this corruption.

Also, Chrysostom speaks about the Jewish translators, that is, Aquila, Symmachuj and Theodotion, who in their translations from Hebrew to Greek stated many thing untruly because of their hatred of the Christian faith, and as a rebuke to the LX] translators. St. Jerome also speaks about this in his letter to Augustine, which is hi 11th letter to Augustine; there he says that he wanted to translate the divine books fror Hebrew, in order to restore what the Jews either omitted or distorted. Jerome in hi cited commentaries has doubts about the same point, but he does not assert it. But ii his commentaries on Isaiah, which he wrote later, as is clear from the preface of hi· commentary on Isaiah and from his book on illustrious men (near the end), he openb ridicules those who think that the Hebrew codices have been falsified.

Secondly, they object to the admission of the Jews, who affirm in passing, that manj things have been changed in the sacred books by some of their sages; and they call those changes "the corrections of the scribes," mnDio ppn.

To this I have two responses. First, perhaps it is not true that any changes in the books were made by the scribes. For the origin of this opinion is the Talmud, which is a most incredible and fanciful book. Thus, neither Epiphanius nor Jerome, who lived before the Talmud was written, ever make any mention of this Tikun Sophrim.

Then I add this: If Tikun Sophrim is not a fable, is not a corruption then it is a true emendation, not produced by some scribes, but by Ezra and by other holy prophets who restored the sacred books after the return from captivity, who, as Jews say, celebrated a council, which they call a great synagogue, because great men were present at it, and during it restored the sacred books to their integrity, which during the time of the captivity had been dispersed and disfigured. Certainly in our Vulgate edition those texts are present that the scribes are said to have corrected; and St. Jerome in his commenta^ on the prophets says that he had read them in the same place.

They say that in Gen. 18:22 where we now have, *Abraham still stood before the Lord,* formerly was, *the Lord still stood before Abraham,* but that this text was changed by the scribes. But the Vulgate edition retains the first reading. Likewise in Num. 11:15,

ifIfindfavor in thy sight, that I may not see WO, that is, my wretchedness; they say that this is a correction of the scribes, and that before it was ηηνηπ, your wretchedness. Moreover, the Vulgate edition has it in the first way.

Further, they say that Hosea 9:12 formerly was ona ˇIΰo, that is, in my flesh from them; but that the scribes corrected it to ΟΠ» '"W3 *when I depart from them.* And the Vulgate edition has *When I depart from them.* Similarly, they say that Habakkuk 1:12 formerly was, *Art thou not from everlasting, O Lord my God, my Holy One,* man *you shall not die?* But the scribes corrected it to, x|? *we shall not die.* The Vulgate has it in this last form, and St. Jerome also reads it in this way. They also say that Malachi 1:12, *but you profane* 'mx *me;* but that the scribes corrected it to, *but you profaned* mix *it.* But certainly the Latin Vulgate with Jerome and the Septuagint translators do not have *Me,* but *It.* I say that same thing about the other corrections of the scribes, which Prochetus has collected in book 1 of the victory over the Jews, and Figuerola Valentinus in chapter 3 of the first part of his book against the Jews.

From all of this it is apparent that some people imprudently believe that, when they oppose the Hebrews, they are opposing the Church herself. For, if those corrections of the scribes of the Hebrew text are corruption, it clearly follows that the Vulgate also has been corrupted. But the Church guarantees it for us as the authentic version.

Thirdly, they object that in Psalm 14 eight verses are missing in all the printed Hebrew codices, namely these: *Their throat is an open grave, / they use their tongues to deceive. / The venom of asps is under their lips. / Their mouth is full of curses and bitterness. / Their feet are swift to shed blood, / in their paths are ruin and misery, / and the way of peace they do not know. / There is no fear of God before their eyes.*

But these verses are quoted by the Apostle in Rom. 3:13-18 and are contained in the Septuagint. But it does not seem possible that this could happen because of the negligence of the copyists, but it does because of the pure malice of the Jews, who deleted these verses from the Hebrew, so that they might show that our Apostle did not faithfully quote the testimony of the Psalm.

St. Jerome responds to this objection, which he had also done previously in the preface of book 16 on Isaiah that these verses do not belong properly to Psalm 14, but that they are quoted by the Apostle from various places in Scripture; then by someone other than that Apostle they were added to the Psalter. For, the first and second of the verses are found in Ps. 5, the third in Ps. 40, the fourth in Ps. 9, the fifth, sixth and seventh in Isaiah 59, the last in Ps. 36. And in the same place Jerome adds that these verses are not in the LXX, and that no Greek author in his commentary wanted to explain these verses. Also Origen in his commentary on Rom. 3 says that the Apostle took these verses from various places in Scripture. With these words he says clearly that these verses are found neither in the Hebrew text nor in the LXX.

But they insist and prove that at one time these verses were in the Hebrew, because now they are found in a certain very old Anglican codex. I respond that those verses in the Anglican codex are obviously an addition. For, not all of the words are Hebrew, like that DTQ = *lot;* nor is the diction, especially in the verse, x|?» **ΠΊΒΊ** n^x QH'D nuzx *Their mouth is full of curses and bitterness.* For the Hebrews do not usually put the verb at the

end. You can find more on this matter in the book of comments on the various readings of the Vulgate edition of Francis Luke of Brugge.

You will say: If that is so, why does the Church allow these verses to be in the Vulgate? Indeed it is for this reason, because they are also parts of sacred Scripture; and because they could not be removed without the confusion and scandal of the people, since they have been there now for a long time; and she also tolerates some typographical errors.

Finally, Cano objects that it is evident that the divine codices have been corrupted by the Hebrews, because in Gen. 8:7 the Hebrew text reads: *the raven was sent out and returned;* while the Vulgate, the LXX and all that Fathers read, *it did not return.* I respond: in Hebrew it is not, *and it returned,* but ΠΙΚΤ NW κχη, that is, *and it went to and fro until the waters were dried up;* this does not mean that the raven returned into the Ark, but that it flew around the Ark, going and returning to the roof of the Ark, and flying away from there, and he did it often until the waters were dried up; so that he went out and did not return agrees very well with this, namely, did not return inside the Ark. Add to this the fact that also there are not lacking Latin codices that have: *it went out and returned,* as can be known from various readings attached to the Louvain Bible.

Therefore, having now refuted two of the opinions, the third remains, which I think is true, and it is that of Driedo in book 2, chapter 1 on Church dogmas and Scripture. It is also the opinion of others who teach that the Hebrew Scriptures in general have not been corrupted by the work or malice of the Jews. But this opinion also holds that they are not completely integral and pure, but have some of their own errors, which crept in partly from negligence, or from the ignorance of the copyists, especially since in Hebrew it is easy to err because of the similarity of some of the letters, such as: 3 and □ and: T and 'I and: π and n : and 'I and T: partly from the ignorance of the Rabbis who added the points. For, since Hebrew expressions can be read in various ways, if they lack the points, if is not surprising if sometimes they also in adding the points have strayed from the truth. It can also happen that, because of a bad attitude and hatred for Christ, a reading sometimes was more approved by them which was less favorable to Christians.

Moreover, errors of this kind are not of such great importance, so that in them what pertains to faith and good morals, the integrity of sacred Scripture would be desired. For, often the total difference of the various readings is located in certain expressions which change the meaning very little or not at all. But errors that come from the addition of the points have absolutely no effect on the meaning; for, the points have been added from the outside and do not change the text. Therefore, we can, if we wish, remove the points and read it differently.

CHAPTER III

ON THE CHALDEAN EDITION

The books of Tobit and Judith were written in the Chaldean language, and in some parts the books Ezra and Daniel. Moreover, the whole old Scripture was translated paraphrastically from Hebrew to Chaldean and they call this paraphrase the Targum. And Rabbi Aquila is said to have translated the Pentateuch, which in Chaldean is called the Onkelus; plus the prior and later prophets, that is, Joshua, Judges, and the books of Kings. Rabbi Jonathan son of Uzielis did the same for Isaiah, Jeremiah and the other prophets. Rabbi Joseph, the blind man, did it for the Psalms, Job, Ruth, Esther, and the works of Solomon.

These paraphrastic translations enjoy great authority among the Hebrews, and therefore they are also useful for us so that from them we can convince the Hebrews. But in other respects they are not considered of importance by the Church, and a solid argument cannot be based on them. Since (as Cardinal Francis Ximenius rightly says in the preface to the Compluten. Bibliography) the Chaldean paraphrases, with the exception of those in the Pentateuch, are interspersed with Jewish fables and the nonsense of the Talmudists. Whoever wants to read the paraphrases in Lamentations, in the Song of Songs, in Job, in the Psalms and in the prophets will learn that this is true by his own experience.

Certainly in chapter 53 of Isaiah, where the prophet clearly is prophesying about the passion of Christ, the paraphrase totally distorts the text and applies it to the calamities of the Jewish people. But in the paraphrase that is in the Song of Songs and the Lamentations, passim one reads about the Talmudic books, two Messiahs, liberation from the captivity of Titus and Vespasian, threats against Christians and Mohammedans. Finally, there are many fables about the lamentation of God, about the ascension of Moses into heaven, about the tablets of the law cut from the sapphire of the divine throne; and there is more about other things of the same nature. But the paraphrase of Aquila in the Pentateuch should not be thought to be totally integral and incorrupt. For, that also has its own errors, although they are fewer and less serious than the others and those of Josephus.

Now we will propose a few examples of this from the individual books. In Genesis 4:23 where the Hebrew text has: WK and the Greek agrees with it, ότι άνδρα άπέκτεινα, and also the Latin, *Quoniam occidi hominem,* the Chaldean paraphrase adds a negative rrb'üp Ί3Λ Kb *I did not kill a man,* and so it gives a contrary meaning. Likewise, in Gen. 22:18 and 26:4 and 28:14 the Hebrew text has, *And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed* ηνΙΤΠ; and the Greek agrees with this, έν τώ σπέρματί σου, and the Latin, *In semine tuo.* And the Apostle Paul in Gal. 3:16 says that the promises should be noted that were made to Abraham and his offspring, and it does not say, *and to his offsprings* as if it were to man, but as if to one, *and to his offspring, which is Christ.* But the Chaldean paraphrase in all these places renders the number of a multitude, η» b'nn *because of your sons all the peoples of the earth.*

In Exodus 12:43 where we read in the Hebrew text Ί31 p bo *No stranger shall eat thereof;* and the Greek agrees, πας άλλογενης, and the Latin, *omnis alienigena.* The

Chaldean paraphrase, out of hatred for neophytes, says:

innwx'i "□ *every destroyed son of Israel.* For thus in passing do the Jews call those who, having left Judaism, are converted to the Christian faith.

In Leviticus 10:6 and in 21:10, where the Hebrew text has D:wxn xb mw *uncover not your heads, neither rend your clothes,* and the Greek and the Latin have the same reading. The Chaldean paraphrase give the opposite reading, Ίηπρ vno xb do not increase the hair of your head.

In Num. 22:19 the fable is placed about the cistern, which the Hebrews imagine went down with the sons of Israel to the torrents, and went up with them to the hills, and from the hills again went down with them to the valleys. And in Num. 23:9 where the Hebrew text has, *a people will dwell alone,* that is, it will not be mingled with other nations: the Chaldean paraphrase renders it in a Jewish manner, *Behold the people alone will possess the world;* for they expect this—that they alone will dominate the world.

Finally, in Deut. 4:28 and 28:64 where the Hebrew, Greek and Latin Scriptures predict that it will come about that the Hebrews will serve will serve foreign gods, which we also know took place more than once: the Chaldean paraphrase takes this crime of idolatry and attributes it to the Gentiles. For, it is translated as: *You will serve peoples who serve idols.* Now a few things will be said about the Aramaic edition.

CHAPTER IV

ON THE ARAMAIC EDITION

Three things should be said about the Aramaic edition. First, what the difference is between the Aramaic language and Chaldean. Then, which sacred books were written in Aramaic. Finally, how great is the authority of this edition.

Therefore with regard to the first point, the Aramaic language is like a child of the Hebrew and Chaldean languages. For, the Hebrews, who until the Babylonian captivity were accustomed to speaking only in Hebrew, that is, their own language, when they were deported to Babylon began to forget their own language and to learn a foreign tongue, that is, Chaldean, but they could not pronounce it perfectly and they always retained something from Hebrew. So it happened that a third language was born which was a mixture of Hebrew and Chaldean, and that is what the Hebrews had from that time for their common and mother tongue. This Aramaic language received its name from the region where it was mainly used, either as the Jerusalem language from the principal city of the Hebrews; or like the Chaldean language, which gets this name from the region of Chaldea and is also called Babylonian from the principal city of Chaldea. In addition, these two languages are distinguished by their characteristics—by the conjugation of the verbs, the prefixes, the points on the letters, the sound of the words, and almost the whole structure of the language, and also by many idiomatic expressions.

Now what pertains to the second point: first of all, it is certain that no book of the Old Testament was written in this language by its first author, except perhaps 1 Macc. and Ecclesiasticus; but Jerome in the prologue to Galatians writes that he had seen the prior one in Hebrew, and he wrote the same about Ecclesiasticus in the prologue to Proverbs. For, it is credible that these books were written in common language of the Hebrews, that is, in Aramaic, but now exist only in Greek. Regarding the other books, it is certain that they were written by the first authors in Hebrew, or Chaldean, or Greek.

About the New Testament there is more doubt: and it is very probable that the Gospel of Matthew and the letter of St. Paul to the Hebrews were written in the Aramaic language; for, that is proved by very powerful arguments by Albert Widmestadius, Chancellor of Ferdinand the Emperor, who was the first one in Europe to provide that the New Testament be printed in Aramaic; and Guido Fabritius whose Latin translation of the Aramaic New Testament is found among the royal Bibles.

The older authors, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius Epiphanius, and Jerome are not opposed to this; they say that these books, especially the Gospel of St. Matthew, were written in Hebrew; for, they are talking about the Hebrew language which at the time of the Apostles was the common language, as in the gospel itself passim we read that something was said in Hebrew, which actually was in the common language, that is, it was spoken in Aramaic, such as what we have in John 19:17: *He went to the place called Calvary, which is called in Hebrew Golgotha.* On these words see St. Jerome in his book on Hebrew names, where he carefully listed all the Aramaic words that are said to be Hebrew by the evangelists. Besides these two books, the whole New Testament was

translated from Greek to Aramaic, the author being (as the Syrians thought) St. Mark the evangelist.

If this were true, there would be no reason to have doubts about the authority of this edition (and we will treat this in the last chapter). But I cannot easily bring myself to believe that an Aramaic version of the whole New Testament was handed on by St. Mark to the Churches of Syria and Egypt; and there is absolutely no mention of this version to be found in Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Theophilus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Cyril, Theodoretus, John Damascene, and other Fathers, who were both in Syria and in Egypt, and were either Bishops or priests; they accurately considered the various editions of the Scriptures and left behind for posterity many writings about the holy Scriptures.

But if the Aramaic edition was produced after the time of these Fathers, and I am firmly convinced that that is the case, its authority cannot be so great that it can rightly be compared with the Greek and Latin editions, not to mention the fact that there are not lacking certain things in that edition, which are not well pleasing to learned and pious men. But there is one significant advantage, in addition to some others, in that edition, namely, because both in the titles and in the sections of the chapters mention is made of fasts, veneration of the Cross, prayers for the dead, vigils, commemoration of the saints, and of other things of this kind, which the Lutherans detest as inventions of the Roman Pontiffs. So this edition itself convicts the Lutherans of a most obvious lie. But enough has been said about the Chaldean and Aramaic editions to satisfy the brevity of this current work. Now we come to the Greek texts.

CHAPTER V

ON THE VARIOUS GREEK EDITIONS

The Greek editions of the Old Testament are nine in number, not counting the one mentioned by Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of his Stromata, which formerly Alexander the Great took possession of; it is uncertain by what author it was produced, but from it Plato and other philosophers drew out not a few things. But since that version, having been replaced later by the famous translation of the seventy elders, at first began to be neglected and then also lost, so that after a long time hardly any memory of it had been preserved and it was dropped from the catalogue.

But that edition, which the seventy elders published at the command of Ptolemy Philadelphus, is customarily named as the first of all translations by the authors, and in the following chapter we will have a lot to say about it. See Eusebius in book 6, chapter 13 of his Histoiy, Athanasius in the Synopsis, and Epiphanius in his book on measures and weights—they put the various translations in order.

The second translation of the Old Testament from Hebrew into Greek was made by Aquila Ponticus in the twelfth year of the Emperor Hadrian, as Epiphanius says in the cited place above. But Aquila was first a Gentile, then a Christian; then having been expelled from the Church because he was devoted to judicial astrology, he turned to the Jews; and since during this last period he translated the Scriptures, he is believed to have done that work without sufficient good faith.

While Commodus was Emperor, the third translation was made by Theodotion. This author, although from being a Marcionite heretic became a Jewish proselyte, according to Eusebius he showed more faith in his translation than the other translators. For this reason the Church always reads Daniel according to the translation of Theodotion, as Jerome says in his preface to Daniel.

The fourth version is that of Symmachus, who translated the sacred books from Hebrew into Greek during the time of Severus Augustus. But I do not know by what error it came about that since Athanasius and Epiphanius write with glowing words that Symmachus under Severus and Theodotion under Commodus son of Mark translated the Scriptures, and there cannot be any doubt but that Commodus preceded Severus; nevertheless, the same authors place Symmachus first and Theodotion after him.

But concerning Symmachus, at first he was an Ebionite, if we are to believe Eusebius; or a Samaritan, if we follow Athanasius and Epiphanius: and since he was not able to obtain the leadership among his own, he went over to the Jews and was circumcised a second time. There Epiphanius mentions in passing that it is not to be surprising that Symmachus could be circumcised twice; since by their medical skill, and with certain instruments the Jews were wont to again cover over the cut foreskin, or to remove the marks of circumcision. And this is what the Apostle is saying in 1 Cor. 7:18: *Was anyone at the time of his call circumcised? Let him not seek to remove the marks of circumcision:* or, so that the Greek words may be more clear μή ἐπισπάσθω, that is, let it not be drawn over.

The fifth Greek version without any name of the author was found in some large wine jars at Jericho in the 7th year of Antoninus Caracalla, who succeeded his father Severus as Emperor, as Epiphanius says in the place cited above.

The sixth version, also without the name of the author, according to the same Eusebius, contained in large wine jars was found at Nicepolis by Alexander Mammacaeus, son of the Emperor.

From all these versions Origen composed, as Eusebius reports in book 6, chapter 13 of his History and also Epiphanius in Heresies 63 and in the book of measures and weights, the version which was called the Hexapla, or the Tetrapla, or also the Octapla. For, at first Origen divided the individual pages into six columns; in the first column he put the Hebrew text in Hebrew letters; in the second column the Hebrew text in Greek letters; in the third the translation of Aquila; in the fourth the translation of Symmachus; in the fifth the translation of the LXX elders; in the sixth the translation of Theodotion. And this volume because of the four translations was called the Tetrapla, and because of the six columns it was called the Hexapla. Then he added the fifth and sixth versions in two more columns and he named that volume the Octapla.

The seventh version is that of Origen, who did not translate the Scriptures from Hebrew, but he so corrected the Septuagint version, with many things taken from Theodotion marked with a star, and many also with a spit, that is, a dagger, that he seemed to have produced a new version. At that time this version received so much approval that soon it was found in all libraries, as St. Jerome says in letter 89 to Augustine, which is the 11th among his letters to Augustine. The same Jerome says in the preface to chapter 16 of Isaiah that this same version was usually called κοινή, that is, *the common version.*

The eighth version is that of St. Lucian, priest and martyr, who, since he saw that many errors had crept into the versions already mentioned, again with great effort produced a new translation. Athanasius writes that this version was found under Constantine the Emperor at Nicomedia, written down by the hand of the same martyr, and preserved in a wall somewhere. St. Lucian suffered in the persecution of Diocletian and Maximian, while Maximinus exercised the supremacy of a tyrant in the East, as the same Athanasius says briefly in the Synopsis, and Eusebius reports more at length in book 9, chapter 6 of his History.

The ninth and last version is that of Hesychius, who again corrected the translation of the LXX elders, and handed it on to the Churches of Egypt. St. Jerome speaks about these versions in the following way in his preface to the books of Chronicles: *Alexandria and Egypt praise Hesychius the author of his version of the Septuagint. Constantinople all the way to Antioch approves the copies of Lucian the martyr. The provinces between them read the Palestinian codices which, having been published by Origen, Eusebius and Pamphilus made known among the people.*

CHAPTER VI

ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE LXX ELDERS

There are five questions concerning the translation of the seventy elders, which among the Greek versions rightly has always held the first place. First, when was it made. Secondly, which books belong in it. Thirdly how was it produced. Fourthly, now much authority does it have. Fifthly, whether or not at this time we have a genuine copy of the work of the 70 elders.

The first question is easy. For, although Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 25, and Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of the Stromata say that the LXX was written when Ptolemy the son of Lagi was reigning, Aristaeus in his history on this matter, Josephus in book 12, chapter 2 of the Antiquities, Philo in book 2 on the life of Moses, Tertullian in chapter 18 of his Apologetics, Athanasius in the Synopsis, Epiphanius in his measures and weights, and other authors all say it was Ptolemy Philadelphus; however, the interval is not so gΓeaζ since this Ptolemy immediately succeeded the former one.

However, this latter opinion is much more probable than the former one, because it has both more and more ancient witnesses. Furthermore, Epiphanius took care to record not only the time of the king, but also the year of the reign. For, he says that the translation of was made in the 17th year of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that there were 291 years from that time until the nativity of Christ. Therefore this translation was made so many years before the coming of Christ, and it was not done without divine assistance. For, as Eusebius records in book 8, chapter 1 of his preparation for the gospel, if it had taken place after the coming of Christ, the Jews either out of envy would have hidden the Scripture, or they would have given us a more corrupt version, or certainly they could easily have raised suspicions about the translators.

The second question is somewhat more difficult. For, St. Jerome in his questions about Hebrews, and on chapter 5 of Ezekiel and on chapter 2 of Micah, seems to be favorable to the opinion that they translated only the Pentateuch, which he proves from Aristaeus in his book on the translation of the seventy-two, and from Josephus in his preface to the Antiquities and in book 12, chapter 2 of the Antiquities, to which you can add Philo in book 2 of his life of Moses, who mention only the Law. But Justin writes in his Dialogue with Trypho that they translated all the books, Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 25, Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of the Stromata, Epiphanius on measurements and weights, Eusebius in book 8, chapter 1 of his preparation—and this seems to be much more probable. For, the Apostles used this Greek version in citing the testimony of the prophets; and at the time of the Apostles there was no other Greek version except that of the Septuagint.

Now it is not probable that that king, who collected books in his library from the whole world, did not also want to have the oracles of the prophets and the ancient books of the Jews. Moreover, how amazing would it be, if during the space of seventy-two days that translation could have been made, and if only the Pentateuch had been translated, which in a shorter time could have been accomplished without any miracle? Jerome does

not affirm the contrary, but he does have his doubts; for in general, and passim, in his commentaries on the prophets he mentions the version of the LXX, and he explains it. And Aristaeus by the word "Law" did not understand the Pentateuch alone, as the Jews seem to think, but all the sacred books. For, from the Law, which was the principal book, all the books were named. Hence, in John 10 and 15 the Lord says that it is written in the Law of the Jews what is written in the Psalms, and St. Paul in 1 Cor. 14:21 says that what is had in Isaiah was written in the Law.

Now in the third question it seems to be certain about what is known by common consent, namely, that seventy-two elderly Hebrew men, from each tribe of the sons of Israel, all expert in both languages and in the space of seventy-two days, by an amazing agreement, translated the divine writings from Hebrew to Greek at Pharus in Egypt. But whether each individual separately made the translation, or they did it in pairs, or all at the same time by working together is a matter of dispute, and still has not been decided. And Epiphanius in his book on measures and weights reports that these were included two by two in little cells, and by a divine miracle each pair translated the whole Scripture with the same words, so that at the same time they composed thirty-six copies of the exact same version.

However, Justin in his prayer for the Gentiles says that each one was placed in a small cell, and that by an even greater miracle the whole Scripture was translated separately with the same words; and he says that he saw the remains of those cells in Alexandria. Several later authors followed Justin on this point, like Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 25, Cyril in his Catechism #4, Clement of Alexandria in book 3 of the Stromata, and Augustine in book 18, chapter 42 of *The City of God,* although Augustine does not want to affirm it in book 2, chapter 15 of his treatise on Christian Doctrine. Some recent defenders of these little cells want to add to the above: Philo in book 2 of his life of Moses, Tertullian in chapter 19 of his Apologetics and Chiysostom in homily 5 on Matthew. But these three do not mention the cells; they say only that miraculously these translators agreed on the same meaning and the same words.

But St. Jerome in his preface to the Pentateuch openly ridicules this history: *I do not know,* he said, *who the first author was who built with his lie the seventy little cells in Alexandria, etc.* Therefore St. Jerome thinks that the seventy-two translators, seated together in the same basilica and working together, translated the Scriptures. He proves this first of all by the testimony of Aristaeus, who was present at the gathering, and clearly says that they met together each day until the ninth hour and finally completed this version in seventy-two days. He proves the same point by the testimony of Josephus, who, since he was very devoted to the glory of his own nation, nevertheless, while narrating this history, in book 12, chapter 2 of his History makes no mention of the little cells.

We can also add to this Eusebius, who in book 8, chapter 2 of preparation for the gospel likewise tells the whole story without mentioning the cells, while reporting literally what is stated in the book of Aristaeus. We add also that Philo, Tertullian and Chrysostom cited above, who when they narrate the miracles, which took place in producing this version, would never have remained silent about these little cells, which was a very

important ροίηζ if they believed that they truly had existed.

But what they say about the great agreement on the same meaning and words, does not necessarily convince us that they are speaking about the small cells. For, it was really miraculous that so many men working together in such a short time could agree on the translation of the individual sentences. For where there is a multitude, a diversity of opinion cannot be avoided, and either they never come to an agreement, or they do so only after lengthy debates. Accordingly, St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 15 of his treatise on Christian Doctrine, concerning what has been repeated again and again about those translators, as if they translated the Scriptures with one voice, says that it can be correctly understood both according to those who defend the cells and according to those who oppose them.

This opinion seems more probable to me. And it seemed more probable also to Titelmanno in the prologue to his Apologetics, and to Andrew Masio in the preface of his notes on Joshua. For, that the Jews convinced Justin with the fable they invented, and having shown him some ruins told him they were the cells of the seventy translators, could easily have taken place; and it is no less easy that some later authors believed a holy man like Justin. But it is not credible that Aristaeus, who was present there, wrote a false report. For, what Louis Vives in book 18, chapter 42 in the City of God, and Leo Castro in the preface to his commenatary on Isaiah 35 say, namely, that this book is not really by Aristaeus but invented by the Hebrews, does not convince me; for, everything that Josephus, Tertullian, Eusebius and Jerome make known from Aristaeus we find is in total agreement with the version that we now have.

But, they say, Epiphanius reads and cites Aristaeus, and still he mentions the little cells, which he would not have done, if the cells were not included in the real book of Aristaeus. I do not know what Leo a Castro wants to accomplish with this testimony of Epiphanius: for, either he wants to conclude that at the time of Epiphanius the whole book of Aristaeus was intact, and afterwards was corrupted, and then obviously he is refuted from Josephus and Eusebius, who wrote before Epihanius, and still did not find the cells in Aristaeus; or he wants to say that before the time of Epiphanius the true book of Aristaeus had not yet been found, but then for the first time was found, and this also cannot be said; for, Jerome, who lived at the same time as Epiphanius and also after him, clearly says that the cells are not proved from Aristaeus, but refuted.

Moreover Epiphanius, contrary to the view of everyone else, says that there were only thirty-six little cells, since the others say either seventy-two or none; and it does not make sense to prefer Epiphanius alone to all the others. Therefore, it is more credible that Epiphanius either did not read Aristaeus but believed other reports, or certainly if he did read it, he did not have it at hand and had a lapse of memory. For it is very probable that Epiphanius accepted the history about the little cells from Justin and Irenaeus, and nevertheless we see that out of forgetfulness he recounted the matter in a way different from what they did.

In the fourth place there is a question about the authority of these translators, and although St. Jerome in his preface to the Pentateuch says that the seventy men were not prophets but translators, and in his questions about Hebrews, and in his letter to Suniam

and Fratellam, and in his commentaries on the prophet passim he criticizes the Septuagint translation, nevertheless it should be certain that the seventy translators made an excellent translation, and that in a special way they had the assistance of the Holy Spirit, lest they err in any way, so that they seem to have been not just translators, but also prophets.

In the first place this is proved from the common opinion. For, all the cited authors constantly assert this—Aristaeus, Philo, Josephus, Justin, Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Cyril; and from the Latins, Tertullian, and Augustine, and also Hilary in his preface to the Psalms, and all the others. And St. Jerome should not be excluded from this number, since he wrote in his preface to 1 Chronicles: if the version of the 70 were had in the original form as it was published by them, he would be working in vain to translate the Bible. And in his preface to 2 Chronicles he says that the seventy translators, being full of the Holy Spirit, made a true translation. Also, in book 2 of his apology against Ruffinus he said that he never wished to detract from the 70 translators.

Hence we understand that when he reprimands the version of the 70, he is not rebuking the original text, but the errors that crept into it afterwards, because of the negligence or malice or the ignorance of others. But when he says that they are translators, not prophets, he is not fighting with what others say in passing, namely, that they were prophets rather than translators; for, the others do not mean to say that they were prophets in the proper sense, but only that they were enlightened in a special way by the Holy Spirit; and Jerome does not deny that, as we show from his own words.

There is also the fact that the Apostles frequently use this version, as is evident from their citations, and Irenaeus says the same thing explicitly in book 3, chapter 15, and also even Jerome in the preface of the gospel to Damasus. And afterwards the Catholic Church for many centuries used the same translation, as the same Jerome writes in his preface to 1 Chronicles. Finally, there is the fact that it could not have taken place without a miracle, so that with such speed, and with such agreement such a work should be accomplished; as a result of this Philo writes in his life of Moses that each year a feast day is celebrated in the place where this translation was made in memory of such a great thing.

Concerning the last question, although I am not ignorant of the fact that some embrace the opinion so that they think that the translation of the 70 has perished completely; but I think it is much more probable that it still survives, but so corrupted and altered that it seems to be something completely different. For many testimonies assure us that it still exists; these testimonies are cited by the ancient authors from the version of the 70, and the same words are now found in our Greek codices. Then since this was always the most famous and common translation, who could believe that, if it had been destroyed or neglected, some other version would be preserved? But it can be proved with many arguments that it is not incorrupL but very much vitiated in several places so that now it is not safe to correct the Hebrew and Latin texts from the Greek codices.

First, according to the testimony of St. Jerome, in his preface to Chronicles, and to Ezra, and elsewhere frequently, warns us that the version of the 70 has been falsified in many different ways.

Secondly, since the 70 translators are said to have translated everything word for word so correctly that whoever knows both languages would know immediately that

the translation is most faithful. For thus writes Philo in book 2 on the life of Moses: *They have been translated exactly, the proper names corresponding from the Greek to the Chaldean. This is known from daily experience, whether a Chaldean learned the Greek language, or a Greek the Chaldean, in both Scriptures, in both the Chaldean and its translation he wonders at the similarity, indeed he reverences the agreement of the things and the words.* But it does not disturb anyone that he calls the Hebrew language Chaldean; for, he does this because the languages are closely related, and at that time Chaldean was better known than Hebrew because of the domination of the Assyrians. Yet St. Jerome demonstrates in comments on Daniel 1 that Hebrew and Chaldean are not the same because the Hebrew Daniel was commanded by king Nebuchadnezzar to learn the Chaldean language.

But not only Philo, but also before Philo Aristaeus bore witness that there was an astonishing agreement of things and words between the Greek and Hebrew codices. And at the end of his book he adds that that translation was discussed, considered and examined by several persons before it was placed in the king's libraiy; and it was praised by all as having been translated conscientiously and faithfully, so that nothing could be added, nothing deleted.

But the Greek version that we now have, in many places disagrees with the Hebrew; it does not have many things that are in the Hebrew and it has many things that are not in the Hebrew, as everyone knows who is familiar with the text. And for those in this matter who cannot make a judgment because of lack of knowledge of the languages, let them read Jerome's preface to the Pentateuch, and his letter to Suniam and Fratellam regarding Hebrews, his commentary on the prophets, and his book on the best kind of translation.

And this argument does not seem sufficiently countered by those who respond that the Hebrew text is corrupt wherever it disagrees with the Greek. For, the heretics, who place the Hebrew text before the Greek, do not admit this, nor should Catholics admit it, lest they be forced to confess that the Latin Vulgate edition, which the Catholic Church has used now for so many centuries, and which the Council of Trent judged to be the authentic text, is also totally corrupt. For, with the exception of the Psalter, the Latin edition agrees more with the Hebrew codices, than it does with the Greek.

Of course I know that Epiphanius in his book on measures and weights, Jerome in the preface to the Pentateuch and in his book on translation and Augustine in book 18, chapters 42 and 44 said that the seventy elders deliberately omitted some things, added somethings, and altered some things because the Holy Spirit so directed them. But those Fathers piously sought reasons to excuse and defend this translation which the Church was using at that time. Moreover, if that is how things were, why did Philo say that there was the greatest agreement on things and words? Also, why did Aristaeus say that all who in the beginning saw it acclaim that each word had been translated well and faithfully? How is it that they did not admire the fact that so many things were removed, so many added, and so many rendered in a contrary sense?

Thirdly, it is proved from the many sentences, which are found in this version, which in no way cohere with the truth. An example of this is the computation of the years of Methuselah in Genesis 5. For, according to the Greek edition it is said that Methuselah

lived 14 years after the flood, but he was not in the Ark, since only eight souls were saved in the Ark, that is, Noah, Shem, Ham and Japheth, and their wives, as we have it in Gen. 6 and 1 Pet. 3.

This difficulty could not be solved in any other way by St. Jerome in his questions about Hebrews, by St. Augustine in book 15, chapter 13 of *The City of God,* by Eucharius and others in comments on Gen. 5, except by admitting that there is an error in the Greek codices; and they did not ascribe this error to the seventy elders, but to those who first copied the books from the library of king Ptolemy. Meanwhile, they could not deny that the codices that we possess now have been corrupted. Another example of this is found in Gen. 26:32 where the LXX has that the servants of Isaac said about the well, *We have not found water,* while the Hebrew and Latin codices have, *We have found water,* and these cannot both be true at the same time. And it is certain that our reading is the true one, since the next words are that, because of this, Isaac named that place "abundance." There is also an example of this in Jonah 3:4, where the LXX has: *Yet three days and Nineveh shall be overthrown,* while the Hebrew and our codices have, *Yet forty days.*

While explaining this passage, St. Jerome shows that it is not possible that the reading of the 70 can be defended, and St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 44 of *The City of God* says that Jonah wrote forty days, not three days. There are many other errors of the same kind, but it is sufficient to cite these three examples.

It is proved finally because it is sufficiently certain that the version of the 70 translators had been corrupted by the Jews in many places, as Justin says in the dialogue with Trypho. Likewise it is certain that the same version was often corrected by Origen, Lucian, Hesychius and Jerome; but nothing is corrected unless it was previously corrupted. And it is not credible that the version, which during its first 300 years contracted so many blemishes, for the next 1200 years remained inviolable and integral.

Finally, it is certain that at the time of St. Jerome, as he himself writes in letter 89 to Augustine, which is 11 among the letters of Augustine, almost all the Greek codices of the Septuagint translation had mixed in with them many things from Theodotion, marked with asterisks, then gradually the asterisks were omitted; the version of Theodotion also was lost. Hence necessarily there arose a certain amount of confusion, so that now no one could know for certain what in those books came from the 70 elders, and what came from Theodotion. This will suffice for the Septuagint.

CHAPTER VII

ON THE GREEK VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Two questions about the Greek version of the New Testament are wont to be debated. The first is about the author of this version. The second is about the authority and integrity of the same version.

The first question is not very difficult. For, it is certain that the New Testament was written in Greek by the Apostles, either by the evangelists, whose names are given in the title of each book, or of the epistles, but with the exception of the Gospel of Matthew and that of Mark, and the letter to the Hebrews. But that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew is testified to by Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 1, by Athanasius in the synopsis, by Jerome in the preface of his commentary on Matthew, and on Hosea 11, and in his book on ecclesiastical authors on Matthew, and many others.

Furthermore, Athanasius, in the place already cited, thinks that the Gospel of Matthew was translated into Greek by the Apostle James; but others think it was done by the Apostle John, and others attribute the translation to Matthew himself. But whoever it was, that translation was so accepted by the Church, as if the Gospel of Matthew had been written first in that language. Therefore we do not have great need for the Hebrew gospel which Munsterus published; nor do we need the one recently published by John Tilius, in which many things are lacking, many things are superfluous, and not a few also are known to have been changed; and God knows whether it was done to destroy faith in the Greek and Latin versions, namely, by the astuteness of the Jews, because of whose encouragement that gospel was produced.

But the book of Mark was written in Latin in Rome by Mark himself, and then by him it was translated into Greek at Aquileia according to Adrian Finus in book 6, chapter 80, and book 8, chapter 62 of the Scourges of the Jews, and Peter Anthony Beuther followed Finus in annotations 8 and 9 on the sacred Scripture. Also in the life of St. Peter, which occupies the first place in the pontifical of Damasus, it is clearly indicated that the Gospel of Mark originally was written by Mark himself in Latin. Concerning the letter to the Hebrews, we have already discussed this and shown that this letter either was written in Greek by Paul himself, or certainly was translated by an apostolic man from Hebrew into Greek. Therefore, the whole Greek version of the New Testament has the Apostles and evangelists as its authors.

Now concerning the authority, there cannot be any doubt but that the apostolic version has the greatest authority, unless perhaps it is established that it is corrupt. On this matter my thought is the same as what we said above about the Hebrew, namely, that the Greek codices in general are not corrupt; however, they are not absolutely pure sources, so that necessarily whatever disagrees with them should be corrected, as Calvin, Major and Kemnitius falsely think, and the other heretics of this time.

Indeed it can easily be demonstrated that the Greek codices in general are not corrupt; for, although the heretics have tried to distort many things, still there were never lacking Catholics who detected their corruptions, and did not permit the sacred books to

be corrupted. Marcion removed many things from the New Testament and changed them, as Tertullian testifies in book 5 against Marcion; but Epiphanius noted almost all of them in Heresies 42 and in our Greek codices they are present in their correct form. The Arians also removed from John 4:24 the words, *God is Spirit,* but St. Ambrose pointed this out in book 3, chapter 11 on the Holy Spirit, and all of our Greek codices have this reading.

However, the words are not everywhere incorrupt, but at times some errors have crept in at least due to the negligence of the copyists, and it is not always safe to correct the Latin from the Greek. A few examples will make this clear. Certainly 1 Cor. 15:47 should read: *The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven,* as not only our Latin version has it, but also Calvin approves it in chapter 7 § 12 of his Institutes. But the Greeks uniformly read, *The second man is the Lord from heaven,* ὁ δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος Κύριος ἐξ οὐρανός. It is clear from Tertullian in book 5 against Marcion that this distortion remained from the faults of the copyists based on the corruptions of Marcion.

Moreover, in 1 Cor. 7:33 where we have: *The married man is anxious about worldly affairs, how to please his wife, and his interests are divided. And the unmarried girl or virgin is anxious about the affairs of the Lord, etc.* The Greek codices are very different, for they join the phrase "his interests are divided" with what follows in this way, μεμέρισται ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος, *the wife and the virgin are divided.* St. Jerome says in book 1 against Jovinian says that this reading does not come from the apostolic truth. In Rom. 12:11 where we read: *Serve the Lord,* the Greeks do not have Κυρίῳ but καιρῷ δουλεύοντες, that is *serve the time.* And it is certain that our reading is the true one, both from Jerome in his letter to Marcellas, which begins with the words *After the first epistle;* here he says, that in the corrected Greek codices we do not find καιρῷ but Κυρίῳ; then we find the same thing in Origen, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and other Greek Fathers, who have our reading, and they explained it in their commentaries.

Finally, it is certain that in several Greek codices many parts of the true Scripture are missing, like the history of the adulteress in John 8, the last chapter of Mark, the beautiful testimony of the Trinity in John 4, and others that we have discussed above. It is also certain that some things can be found in all the Greek codices which are not parts of the divine Scripture, as in Matt. 6 where, to the Lord's Prayer is added, *For thine is the kingdom, and the power and the glory forever;* these words are not in the text, but it can be shown by two reasons that they were added by the Greeks. First, because Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine explain the Lord's Prayer, but do not mention these words. Secondly, because the Greeks in their liturgy indeed recite these words, but they do not join them to the Lord's Prayer.

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE LATIN VERSIONS

On the Latin versions there are three points that we have to explain. First, how many and which ones were formerly the Latin versions. Secondly, who is the author of what is now called the Vulgate. Thirdly, how great is the authority of this Vulgate edition.

And in order to start at the beginning, St. Augustine says in book 2, chapter 11 of his treatise on Christian Doctrine that the Latin versions of the Old Testament from the Greek LXX, and of the New Testament from the Greek source were almost innumerable before the time of Jerome. Here are his words: *Those who translated the Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek can be numbered, but the Latin translations can in no way be numbered. For, in the first times of the faith when a Greek codex came into the hands of anyone, and he seemed to have some knowledge of both languages, he proceeded to translate it.* Similarly, St. Jerome teaches in his preface to Joshua: *Since among the Latins there are as many versions as there are codices, and each man according to his own judgment either added or removed what seemed best to him.*

Nevertheless there was one more common version, which was called the old Vulgate version, as is clear from St. Gregory in the preface to his book on Morals (ch. 5), and from St. Jerome on chapters 14 and 49 of Isaiah, and elsewhere. And this seems to be that Italian translation, which St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 15 of his Christian Doctrine places before all the other Latin versions, when he says: *Among those translations, the Italian is preferred to the others; for, it is closer to the original with its accurate rendition.*

But St. Jerome translated the Old Testament into Latin twice, first from the Greek, that is, from the Septuagint, as can be known from book 2 against Ruffinus, and from letter 10 of Augustine and the following letter 11 of Jerome to Augustine, and also from his preface to Job. And secondly he translated it from the Hebrew, as he himself says towards the end of his book on famous men, and in the prefaces of the individual books which he translated into Latin.

However, he did not translate the New Testament from Greek to Latin, but he only corrected its many errors, which had crept into it through the fault of the copyists. About his own work he himself says in his book on illustrious men, towards the end: *I restored the New Testament of Greek faith.* And in the preface of the gospels to Damasus he said: *We used the pen with moderation, so that, having corrected only those things which seemed to change the meaning, we allowed the rest to remain as they were.* But if someone thinks that the New Testament was translated by him, since St. Augustine in letter 10 to Jerome writes: *Therefore we do not give small thanks to God for your work of translating the gospel from Greek, etc.,* let him hear Jerome resolving this doubt in letter 89 to Augustine, which is #11 among the letters of Augustine: *If you honor me regarding the improvement of the New Testament, etc.*

Subsequently St. Jerome's version from Hebrew into Latin soon began to be accepted by some Churches, and to be read in public, as is clear from letter 10 of Augustine to Jerome, but in such a way that the older version was not discarded. This is made clear

by St. Gregory in the letter before the preface to his book on Morals (ch. 5), where he says that during his time the Roman Church was accustomed to use both versions, that is, the old version from Greek, and the new version of Jerome from Hebrew. However, after the time of St. Gregory all the Latin versions seem to have disappeared except the one, which we now call the old one and the Vulgate; soon we will say something about its author. But in our century once again we seem to have returned to that previous age, in which everyone who has some ability immediately decides to translate the sacred books. Accordingly, the Latin translations of more recent men, especially of the heretics, can hardly be counted. But we have said enough about this.

CHAPTER IX

ON THE AUTHOR OF THE VULGATE VERSION

It is not a minor question about our Latin version of the Vulgate: Is it the ancient one, which existed before Jerome, or is it the version of Jerome, or a mixture of both of them? That it is not that of St. Jerome is what is thought or suspected by Sanctes Pagninus in the preface of his translation of the books given to Clement VII, the Sovereign Pontiff, and by Bishop Paul Foro Sempronius in book 2, chapter 1 in his book on the day of the Lord's passion. On the opposite side, that it is the work of St. Jerome is the view of Augustine Eugubinus, and John Picus Mirandulanus in their books published on this matter, and some others. But that it is a mixture of the old and the new is taught by John Driedo in book 2, chapter 1 in his book on the dogmas of the Church and the Scriptures, and Sixtus of Siena in book 8 of his library.

Therefore, for the sake of brevity and clarity, we will express our opinion in four propositions.

The first proposition: *We have the New Testament as the Latin version of the Vulgate from the ancient version, which however St. Jerome improved:* we can prove this especially with the argument, that many of the places which St. Jerome criticizes in the ancient version, we find in our version corrected in the way in which he says they should be corrected. And we can confirm this with a few examples: in his commentary on Matt. 2:1 he says, that *In Bethlehem of Judea,* should be, *In Bethlehem of Judah.* In book 1 against Jovinian he criticizes that 1 Cor. 7:34, *The woman and the virgin are divided,* and he says it should read, *The unmarried woman and the virgin, etc.* In his letter to Marcellas, at the end of the second part, he rejects this phrase in Rom. 12:11, *Serve the times,* and says that it should be, *Serve the Lord.* In the same place, he criticizes this phrase in 1 Tim. 1:15, *The saying is human,* and says that it should be read as, *The saying is sure.* In his comments on Gal. 2:5 he rejects the reading, *To them we yielded submission for a moment,* and he replaces it with, *To them we did not yield submission even for a moment.* And in his comments on Gal.5:8 he rejects the words, *Your persuasion is from God,* and he wants it to read, *This persuasion is not from him who called you.* In comments on Eph. 1:14 he criticizes this, *Who is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire adoption,* and wishes to substitute, *Who is the guarantee of our inheritance until we acquire possession of it.* But all of these changes, and many others like them, we now have in the Vulgate edition, just as he says they should be read.

Moreover, it is certain that Jerome corrected the New Testament at the command of the Pontiff Damasus; and it is also certain that his correction was accepted and was veiy pleasing to the men of that time, as can be concluded from letter 10 of Augustine to Jerome; therefore it is not probable that it was later rejected, but rather was retained and preserved.

And it should not be surprising that some texts were not corrected, as Jerome warned that they should be corrected, such as the phrase in Rom. 12:3, *To think with sober judgment,* which Jerome in book 1 to Jovinian wishes to be read as, *To think with*

modesty. And the expression in 1 Cor. 13:3, *If I deliver my body to be burned,* which Jerome in Gal. 5 says should be read as, *So that I may be glorified;* and there are some other ones which he corrects in his comments on the epistles to the Galatians, to the Ephesians, and to Titus. For, he says in the preface of the gospel for Damasus that he did not want to correct everything, which he thought should be corrected, lest he seem to have corrected too much.

Furthermore, it could be that, when he wrote those commentaries, he thought some things should be changed, which however later, when he began to correct the New Testament, having considered the matter more thoroughly, he judged should not be changed. For, that he wrote those commentaries, before he actually corrected the New Testament, is gathered from the end of his book on illustrious men, and surely our version in these two places is better than that which at that time St. Jerome wanted to be replaced.

The second proposition: *The Psalter of the Latin Vulgate version is not that which St. Jerome translated from Hebrew, nor is it the one that he translated from the Septuagint, but it is the one he corrected, translated from the ancient Greek translation of the version of St. Lucian the martyr; for, St. Jerome translated the Psalter four times. He translated it once from Hebrew to Latin, as is clear from his letter to Sophronius; then he converted it from Greek to Latin from the pure version of the Septuagint, as it is contained in the Hexapla of Origen, as he says in his letter to Suniam and Fratellam; finally, twice he corrected the ancient Latin version, which had been translated from the common and daily Greek, as is known from the preface to the Psalter for Paula and Eustachius.* Now we will briefly prove each point.

Therefore, we are saying that our Psalter is not the one which St. Jerome translated from Hebrew—and this is certain. For, it is present in the works of St. Jerome, and almost everywhere it disagrees with our Psalter, at least with regard to the wording.

In addition, it is not the one he translated from the Hexapla of Origen, but the common one which he corrected twice, and this is proved from his letter to Suniam and Fratellam; for, there he says that what is said in Ps. 5:8, *Make my way straight before me,* is worded differently in the LXX and all other translations, with the exception of the Vulgate. But our versions has those words; therefore our version is the common and Vulgate one and distinct from the genuine translation of the 70 elders. Moreover, in the same place Jerome says that what is had in Ps. 74:8, *Let us rest on all the feast days of the Lord in the land,* is worded in the LXX in the Hexapla and in all the other translations as: *Let us burn all the meetingplaces of God in the land,* and only in the Vulgate is had, *Let us rest.* But we have, *Let us rest.* Similarly, what we have in Ps. 104, *The rocks are a refuge for the badgers,* the LXX has, *A refuge for warmth;* therefore our version is not the same as the LXX.

Finally, in his whole letter he often quotes the words of the Latin Psalter, as it was then in common use, and was sung in the Churches; but we final all those words in our Psalter; therefore our Psalter is the same as that common and vulgate one. Then it is obvious from the letter to Suniam and Fratellam that that version was called "common" by Jerome, which Origen, and later Lucian corrected. For at the beginning of his letter Jerome says this: *You should know that there is another version besides that of Origen*

and Eusebius of Caesarea; and all the Greek authors call it κοινή, that is, common and well known, and by many it is now called λουκιανός, different than the Septuagint which is found in the ἑξαπλοίς codices.

The third proposition: *It seems probable to us that the books of Wisdom, Ecclesiastes and Maccabees are not from the version of Jerome, but are from the ancient translation, whose author is unknown.* We have our reasons for this. First, because St. Jerome nowhere says that he translated these books, and there are no prefaces of his to these books; however, he says in letter 89 to Augustine, which is #11 among Augustine's letters, that he prefixed a short preface to each of the books. Secondly, because St. Jerome thought that these books are apocryphal, as is clear from his prologue to Galeato and from his preface to Proverbs. Therefore, it is probable that he did not translate these books. Thirdly, because many things are cited from these books by St. Cyprian, especially in his book on exhortation to martyrdom, and by other Fathers who lived before St. Jerome, exactly as we now have them in our Vulgate version.

The fourth proposition: *We have in our Vulgate edition all the other books from Jerome's translation from Hebrew.* Here is our proof.

First, because it is certain that St. Jerome was the first and only one of the ancients to have translated the Old Testament from Hebrew into Latin, except for the Psalms, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus and Maccabees. He himself says, at the end of his book on illustrious men, that he could translate from Hebrew. That he was the first one among the ancients to do it, is clear from Augustine in letters 8 and 10, and from book 18, chapter 43 *oî The City of God,* and from all of Jerome's prefaces, in which he always rejects the calumny that he dared to translate from the Hebrew. It is absolutely certain that after him and until our own time no one else has attempted to do the same.

Now that the translation of the Vulgate edition is from Hebrew is most obvious, since almost everywhere it agrees with the Hebrew and differs from the Greek translations. Moreover, there are certain indications of this matter in almost all of the books. For, in the Pentateuch, especially in Gen. 5, all the ancient books, which were based on the LXX, contained that error about the number of years, but our version agrees with the Hebrew. In the books of Esther and Daniel, we often find in those books brief notes of St Jerome saying that he had expressed faithfully what was in the Hebrew, but that he had added some other things from the Vulgate edition or from Theodotion.

In the preface to Job he says that in the ancient Latin and Greek versions of the book of Job about 800 verses are missing, which he included from the Hebrew in his translation; but our version is integral and full, and does not have fewer verses than the Hebrew. Finally, in his comments on the prophets, almost everywhere he gives and explains two versions, that is, his which is in our Vulgate edition, and the other of the Septuagint translators.

It is proved secondly, because everything which St. Jerome says in the preface to the Pentateuch, and in his book on interpretation, is not contained in the LXX, and what he added in his translation from the Hebrew we find in our Vulgate edition, like the following: *Out of Egypt I called my son,* Hos. 11:1, and *They will look upon me whom they have pierced,* Zech. 12:10, and *No eye has seen a God besides thee, who works for*

those who wait for him, Isa. 64:4.

Thirdly, it is proved from those places where St. Jerome says that he has translated them in a way different from that of the LXX translation—and we find all of these in our version, as he says that he translated them. In letter 89 to Augustine, which is #11 among the letters of Augustine, he says that in Jonah 4:6 he translated the Hebrew word for a plant with *ivy,* where the LXX has *gourd.* Similarly, in questions about the Hebrew in Genesis, he says that Gen. 2:2 should read, *On the seventh day God finished his work,* while the LXX says it was *on the sixth day.* In the same place he says the text should read, *she shall be called a man-like maiden* (Latin: *virago),* while in the LXX she is called *Woman.* Again, in the same place he says the text should read: *He caused a deep sleep to fall upon the man,* while the LXX has, *He caused an ecstasy to fall upon the man.* Many similar things are found, both in questions about the Hebrew and in comments on the prophets.

St. Gregory also in book 20, chapter 32 in his book on Morality, while explaining the phrase, *Thou hast turned cruel to me,* says that the ancient translation was very different, but that this new one made from the Hebrew is much better. But in our version it reads, *Thou hast turned cruel to me* (Job 30:21).

Fourthly, it is proved from the prefaces. For, he says in the letter to Augustine, which was quoted above, that he prefixed a short preface to almost all the books he translated from Hebrew, which we also now see in the Bibles of the Vulgate edition, and no one has ever denied that they are by Jerome. But it is certainly not credible that his whole work has perished, except only those short prefaces. Of those who have thrown away or neglected the version of St. Jerome, why, I ask, did they preserve his short prefaces?

But in opposition three main arguments are mainly put forth. The first argument is that of Paul Foro Semproniensis and Sanctes Pagninus, taken from many places in which our version disagrees with the Hebrew original; and it is not credible that Jerome, who was very expert in Hebrew, could err in such a matter.

I respond that there are two reasons why our version might seem at times to depart from the Hebrew text. One is, and it is very obvious, because of the carelessness of the copyists and he does complain about this passim in his prefaces. Another reason is because often St. Jerome strives to express not so much the exact words but the meaning, as he says should be done in his book on making a good translation. There is an example of this in the words of Eccles. 1:15, *It is difficult to correct the wicked, and the foolish cannot be numbered.* For these words seem to mean something quite different from what the Hebrew has literally:

nom nprfr tor K!? TWO nwrft tor là, that is, *What is crooked cannot be made straight, and what is lacking cannot be numbered.* But certainly Jerome expressed the meaning elegantly. We will say more about this argument in the following chapter.

The second argument. Jerome in the preface to the Psalms, to Job and to Chronicles says that he marked his changes with asterisks and obelisks; but in our Vulgate we do not see these signs; therefore out Vulgate edition is not that of Jerome.

I respond with the words of Jerome himself, in his letter to Augustin cited above, that Jerome distinguished with asterisks and obelisks in the translation which he had

made from Greek, but not in the one he made from Hebrew. Therefore, in our Vulgate Psalter there should be asterisks and obelisks, which Jerome mentions in the preface, but they were omitted because of the negligence of the copyists; and this is not surprising, for even in his time they began to omit them, as is clear from his preface and from his letter to Suniam and Fratellam. However, in the book of Job and in Chronicles in our Vulgate there never were, nor should there be asterisks and obelisks. Hence we have two prefaces, both to Job and to Chronicles, of which the first, in which there is no mention of asterisks and obelisks, pertains to our version which is from Hebrew; the latter, in which those marks are mentioned, pertains to the other translation which he made from the Greek.

The third argument. Many things are found in our Vulgate, which St. Jerome in his Hebrew questions, in his book on a good translation, in his commentary on the prophets and on Ecclesiastes said should have been translated differently. Therefore it cannot be the case that our Vulgate edition is the very same translation which Jerome made from Hebrew.

I respond that there are four reasons why some things are in our text, which St. Jerome disapproves of. The first is the error and negligence of the copyists. The second reason is the different meaning of some words; for sometimes they can mean two things: and St. Jerome used now one, now another meaning. We have an example of this in Ecclesiastes; for, St. Jerome translated Ecclesiastes two times, as is clear from the preface of his commentary on Ecclesiastes, and in the preface to Proverbs. Actually, in the first translation he translated 2:3 as, *I searched with my mind how to cheer my body with wine,* and he also explains this in the commentary. But in the second translation he preferred to render it thus: *I searched with my mind to withdraw my body from wine,* which is the reading we now have, and our reading is better. For, the Hebrew word]"□ can signify *with wine,* and also *from wine.* For, the letter □ can be used for both "with" and "from." But the context requires "from wine" rather than "with wine." For, what follows is, *that my mind may guide me to wisdom.*

But that the letter □ frequently is used for pa , that is, "from," is evident in these places: Exod. 12:43; 35:32; 38:8 and Lev. 8:32 and 2 Chron. 16:6. But that St. Jerome is wont to translate in various ways, when the words permit it, he himself says in book 1 of his Apology against Ruffinus, where he says that in Psalm 2 he translated: *Adore perfectly,* and nevertheless he explained it as *Adore the Son,* since the Hebrew word here is ambiguous.

The third reason is because he changed his mind later, and he corrected his own expressions. Here is an example of this. In his book on a good translation, and in his preface to the Pentateuch, he says that Isa. 11:1 should not be read as: *A branch shall grow out of his roots,* but as, *A Nazarene shall grow out of his roots.* And he says that the LXX wrongly omitted this name "Nazarene" and that this text is cited by Matthew in chapter 2 where he says: *that what was spoken by the prophets might be fulfilled, "He shall be called a Nazarene."* But he himself later made the same translation, just as the Septuagint had translated it, namely: *A branch shall grow out of his roots.* And in his commentary on Isa. 11 he gives the reason for this, because the Hebrew word located

there צנ is written with the letter *Tsade,* while Nazarene is expressed by the word נז with the letter Zayin. Therefore in his commentary on Matt. 2 he says that the words, *He shall be called a Nazarene,* are not taken from any one prophet, but from the fact that all the prophets foretold that he would be the holy Lord. For a similar reason in book 5 of his commentary on Isaiah he admits that in chapter 19:17 he had badly translated, *The land of Judah will become a pleasure to the Egyptians,* since rather he should have translated it, *a terror,* and in the Vulgate we now have this latter rendition.

The fourth reason is, because although St. Jerome at times thought that some things should be changed in his translation, and he said this in his commentaries, nevertheless the Church later judged his first version to be more true, and she chose to retain it in the Vulgate edition. For, in book 5 of his commentary on Isaiah, where St. Jerome says that he translated "pleasure" in place of "terror," he says that he had badly translated "restrained" in place of "lascivious,"; however, we see in our Vulgate edition the first correction of Jerome accepted, which certainly does not seem to have been done by chance, but by the judgment of posterity, or rather of the Church herself. And in this way a response can be made to many other things. For the Vulgate edition, although for the most part is by Jerome, still it is not the complete one that he translated from the Hebrew, but it is in a certain sense a mixture, since not a few things have been added from the LXX, which are not found in the Hebrew, and this is especially evident in 1 Samuel and in Proverbs.

To all of this can be added, that sometimes Jerome seems to criticize our version, since he does not find fault with it, but he is only explaining what the meaning is of a Hebrew word; as when in the Hebrew questions he says that in Genesis 1, for what we have, *the Spirit of God was moving over the waters,* in Hebrew it means, *hovered over or brooded over like a bird.*

CHAPTER X

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE LATIN VULGATE EDITION

Thirdly, the most important question remains to be answered, namely, how great is the authority of the Latin Vulgate edition. And surely the heretics of our time, although among themselves they disagree in no small way in choosing the authentic Latin edition, still they are all in strong agreement against the Church. Accordingly, the Lutherans want only Luther's translation to be considered as authentic, as is clear from a certain Leipzig decree, which was endorsed by Melanchthon, Pomeranus, Major, and many others. Concerning this decree, consult Staphilus in the third topical predicament of Lutheran theology.

But the Zwinglians, with whom the Anabaptists and Calvinists agree, want no version to be authentic, as is clear from the preface of the Zurich edition. They teach there that the Church should not be bound to one version. Nevertheless, both Lutherans and Zwinglians agree on this point, that the Latin Vulgate edition should not be held as authentic, since innumerable errors are found in it.

Hence from the Lutheran camp Martin Kemnitius came out to do battle, and John Calvin from the camp of the Zwinglians. They wrote against the Council of Trent, and they attacked especially session four in which the Council defined that the Latin Vulgate edition is to be embraced as the authentic one. George Major also wrote about the same matter in his preface to the Psalms, and Tilmann Heshusius did the same in his book on the six hundred errors of the Pontiffs.

But not a few authors wrote in favor of the Vulgate, among whom are John Driedo in book 2, chapter 1 of his treatise on ecclesiastical dogmas and Scriptures, Francis Titelmannus in the apologetic prologue for the Vulgate edition of the New Testament, Andreas Vega in book 15, chapter 9 on the Council of Trent, Jodocus Tiletanus in the first part of his apology for the Council of Trent against Kemnitius, Lindanus in book 1 in his work on translation, Melchior Cano in book 2, chapter 13 in his book on theological places, Sixtus of Siena in book 8 of the holy library in refutation of the last heresy. While wishing to imitate their diligence, we will prove the same thing with the following aiguments.

The first argument is that of the Council itself. For, the Tridentine Synod says that that Latin version of the sacred books is approved by the Council, which by long use in the Church for so many centuries has been approved. For, the whole Latin Church used this one version not rashly for almost a thousand years, that is, from the time of St. Gregory the Great; all preachers explained it and proposed it to the people, all the councils took testimony from this version in order to strengthen the dogmas of the faith. Then it is amazing that the Church for 800 or 900 years did not have the genuine translation of the Scriptures, and in the things that pertain to faith and religion incurred I know not how many errors of interpretation of the word of God, especially since she learned from the Apostle in 1 Tim. 3:15 that she is *the pillar and the bulwark of the truth.*

The second argument I take from the testimonies of the ancients. For, either our

version is that of Jerome, or certainly it is the ancient common one which Augustine calls the Italian: if it is the ancient one, it has great testimony from Augustine in book 2, chapter 15 of his book on Christian Doctrine, where he says that it is to be preferred to all others; but if it is that of Jerome, as we have proved above, it has the testimony of all the ancients, who were able to see it. For, first of all, St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 43 of *The City of God* says: *Our times, however, have enjoyed the advantage of the presbyter Jerome, a man most learned, and skilled in all three languages, who translated the same Scriptures into Latin, not from Greek, but from Hebrew, Although the Jews acknowledge this great work of his to be faithful, etc.* And in letter 10 to Jerome he says, his version, or rather emendation of the New Testament is approved by all. Likewise, St. Gregory in book 20, chapter 32 of his *Magna Moralia* said: *Because this new translation from Hebrew is proposed to us as truer than all the others, whatever is said in it should be believed, and it is necessary that our exposition examine its words very accurately.*

St. Isidore in book 6, chapter 4 of his etymology said: *The presbyter Jerome, an expert in all three languages, translated the same Scriptures from Hebrew into the Latin language and he did it in an eloquent way; generally speaking, all the Churches everywhere use this translation, because it is truer in the meaning, and clearer in its words.* This is the one that Rabanus endorsed in book 2, chapter 54 in the instruction for clerics.

Then those who followed in succession, St. Anselm, St. Bernard, Rupert, Haymo, Hugo, Richard, and all the others show sufficiently that they preferred this edition to the others, since they used only it for explanation. Add to this also that not only the Latins approved this version, but also the Greeks, who themselves translated from Latin into Greek some of the divine volumes that had been translated by Jerome into Latin from the Hebrew, as St. Jerome says in his book on *The Lives of Famous Men* on Sophronius, and in book 2 against Rufinus.

The third argument. The Hebrews had the authentic Scripture in their own language; the Greeks also had the authentic Scripture in Greek, that is, the Old Testament of the LXX, and the first sources of the New Testament. Therefore it was only right that the Latin Church, where the seat of Peter is located, and where the Christian faith will always remain, should have the authentic Scripture in her own language; and for almost a thousand years she did not have anything but that. Therefore it must be thought to be authentic.

The fourth argument. In the general councils of the Church, either very few, or sometimes none of the members were found to be expert in the Hebrew language. Therefore it would have been very bad for the Church, if in serious matters she could not have faith in the Latin version, but had to recur to the Hebrew codices, and ask the hostile Rabbis for the true meaning. We can say the same thing about the Greek language; for although now everywhere many are found who know Greek, still it was not always so. For, if we are to believe Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 23 of his history, of the 600 bishops who were present at the council of Ariminum, there was not one who knew the meaning of the word ὁμοουσιος. And accordingly, when some clever Arian heretics asked the synod, whether it wished to worship Christ, or ὁμοουσιος, they all shouted that they did

not want to worship ὁμοουσιος, but Christ.

Finally the same thing is proved from experience. For we see heretics who, out of contempt for the ancient version, strive to produce their own translations, so that they turn out such diverse and mutually contradictory versions that almost nothing certain can be obtained from their translations. Accordingly, Martin Luther in his book against Zwingli on the true body of Christ in the Eucharist said: *If the world lasts any longer, it will again be necessary that, because of the diverse translations of the Scripture which now exist, in order to preserve the unity of the faith we will have to receive the decrees of the councils and have recourse to them.*

There still remain arguments of the adversaries to refute, but before we do that, it may help to note certain obvious lies, which Martin Kemnitius and John Calvin have mixed in with their arguments.

The first lie is that of Calvin, that neither by a decision nor by a right choice did it happen that of the different translations that one held the chief place among the unlearned. And certainly when all the other translations were discarded, our version was used in the Church for more than a thousand years, and either for the whole thousand years there were no learned men in the Church, or Calvin is lying shamelessly. Then I do not think that Sophronius, Augustine, Rupert, Bernard, and many other outstanding men should be numbered among the unlearned; nevertheless all of them praised our translation, as we proved above, to be either among the others or preferred to others,

Another lie of the same man is that the Tridentine fathers decreed that those should in no way be heard who bring forth pure liquid from the fountain itself, and from a certain truth prove that something is false. I call this a lie because nothing like this is found in the decrees of the Council. For, the fathers made no mention of the fountains, but only that they chose one that they placed before the others from among the many Latin versions which are now being circulated; and (something that befits the gravity and firmness of the Church) they chose the ancient over the new, what was proved by long use in preference to what is more recent and, so to speak, is crude; finally they preferred one version over the many that disagree and fight with each other.

The third lie is one from the same Calvin, namely, that in the same Vulgate translation there is not one whole page where there are three continuous verses that are not notable for some horrible error. But if that is the case, why does Calvin in the same place, when he points out in the Psalms the bad verses, make no mention at all about the translation of the first Psalm? Is it because perhaps the first Psalm does not have three continuous verses? But it is not necessary, in my opinion, to spend more time in refuting such obvious lies. Now we come to Kemnitius.

The first lie of Kemnitius is that the Council of Trent decreed that, in place of those things which the Holy Spirit wrote in the Hebrew and Greek sources, we receive those that have been changed, mutilated or added by the copyists. There is no one who does not understand that this is a manifest lie. For what man, I do not mean just a Catholic, but any sane man, ever said that the errors of the copyists should be taken for the words of the Holy Spirit? Furthermore, did not the Council in the same place decree that the Holy Bible should be printed as free from mistakes as possible?

The second lie of the same man is this: that in the published index of the books prohibited by Paul IV, all the editions of the Bible are condemned, even of the ancient translations, in which even the most obvious errors of the Vulgate edition have been corrected. This also is a crass lie; for, in that index no editions are condemned except certain editions by the heretics, or by suspect publishers; and all the others are permitted.

The third lie of the same Kemnitius is this: that the Council of Trent in session 21, canon 2, in order to prove that the Church has authority of dispensing in the substantial of the sacraments, contrary to the institution of Christ, used an equivocation of the old version where in 1 Cor. 4:1 the ministers of Christ are called *stewards of the mysteries of Christ.* In this place Kemnitus exclaims: *Good God, how great is the impudence of the Antichrist, in such great light of the knowledge of languages, to play in such a childish manner with such grave matter! Since Paul calls the ministers of Christ* οικονόμους. These are his words.

But we can rightly exclaim: Good God, how great is the impudence of a heretical man, who does not hesitate to substitute a crass lie for the truth! For, the Council there clearly says that the Church cannot change the substantiate of the sacraments, but can determine only the manner and the order in which the sacraments should be administered. Also, the Council does not misuse the word "steward," as Kemnitius foolishly imagines; for she does not say that the Church can dispense in the matter of the sacraments, as she does dispense regarding vows and laws, but that she can dispense the sacraments, that is, administer, give, hand on to the faithful; and like a faithful and prudent overseer in dispensing his master's goods and caring for his family, she can prescribe a certain way of doing things, provided that nothing be done contrary to the laws and the commands of her master.

Kemnitius's last lie is that the Tridentine Council wanted the Vulgate version to be authentic because everything has been changed to support the pontifical dogmas. This lie is not only that of an impudent man, but also of an imprudent one, since it works strongly against its own author. For, if the pontifical dogmas are given in the Vulgate edition, it follows that the pontifical dogmas are very ancient, and that their contrary dogmas clearly are recent, because they themselves admit that the Vulgate version is very ancient.

Furthermore, if the Vulgate Bible had been made after the time of Luther, there would be some reason for suspecting that it had been deliberately accommodated to the pontifical dogmas; but it was made more than a thousand years ago, and everything they find fault with in the Vulgate, we will show was cited as such by the ancient Fathers, and was always in the Vulgate version in the same manner. But what the adversaries do, they think is also done by others: and because Martin Luther translated the Bible in bad faith, as is clear from John Cochlaeus in the life and deeds of Luther in 1522, where we read that in the new translation made by Luther of the New Testament, it has been pointed out that it has been changed in a thousand places, that is, by additions, or omissions, or corruptions. Therefore, they think that Catholics also do the same thing, but in this they are certainly wrong: for the Catholic faith does not need the help of lies, which are figments of their imagination.

CHAPTER XI

OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS AGAINST THE VULGATE EDITION ARE ANSWERED

There are three arguments of the heretics against the Vulgate version of the Bible. The first is, that St. Jerome translated many things in a way different from what we have, and he finds fault with many things in our Vulgate edition; but we have already answered that above in chapter 8. The second argument. It is more credible that what is had in the sources of the Hebrew and Greek codices is the word of God, than what is had in the rivulets of the versions; for, the Hebrew and Greek codices are from the prophets and Apostles, who cannot err. But the Latin codices are from various translators, who can err. For Jerome teaches in the preface to the Pentateuch that it is one thing to be a translator, but it is something else to be a prophet. And the same Jerome passim criticizes the old translator in his commentaries, as in book 1 against Jovinianum; St. Augustine not only says in general that translators can err, in book 2, chapter 12 of his Christian Doctrine, and in letters 19 and 59, but also in letter 8 to Jerome he says that Jerome could have erred in his translation.

Then there is what the Fathers say in passing—that it is necessary to go back to the Hebrew and Greek sources. Jerome in the book against Helvidius and in his letter to Marcellas, which begins with the words "After the first letter," says that the Latin translation of the gospels must be based on the Greek sources; and he says the same thing about the Latin version of the Old Testament—that it must be based on the Hebrew; he says this in his commentary on Zech. 8. Augustine says the same thing in book 2, chapters 11, 12 and 15 of his Christian Doctrine, and in letter 59 and elsewhere. And what is more amazing, in the pontifical law itself in canon 9, "Ut veterum," it says this: *Just as the faith of the ancient books is to be examined in the Hebrew volumes, so also the truth of the new books seeks its norm in the Greek language.*

I respond that it cannot be denied that the founts of the Scriptures should be preferred to the rivulets of the translations, when it has been established that the founts have not been disturbed. But we have already shown above that the founts in many place have been disturbed, and certainly it can hardly be doubted that as the Latin Church was more constant than the Greek in retaining the faith, so also she was more vigilant in defending her codices from corruption. For what long ago Jerome wrote to Damasus in his letter about the word "hypostasis," now especially is relevant, namely, while the patrimony was squandered by the Greeks, only among the Latins was the inheritance from the Fathers preserved incorrupt.

But with regard to the objection that a translator can sometimes err, there are not lacking those who respond: the old translator of the New Testament, and also St. Jerome, the translator of the Old Testament, having been guided by a special light of the Holy Spirit, could not err, but it is not necessary to take refuge in that view. For we admit that a translator is not a prophet and can err; we do say, however, that he did not err in that version which the Church has approved.

For, the Vulgate edition is not from one author, but it has something from Jerome,

something from Lucianus, something from Theodotion, something from another unknown translator. However, it does seem stupid to say that the heretic Theodotion could not err, and also that Jerome erred nowhere, since he himself says on chapter 19 of Isaiah that he made some errors, and the Church received his correction. Therefore, the Church did not canonize those authors, but only approved this version; but she did not approve it in such a way that she said that no errors of the copyists could be found in it. But she wished to make us certain, especially in the things that pertain to faith and morals, that there are no errors of the translators in this version.

On the other point about the correction of the Latin codices by comparing them with the Hebrew and Greek, I respond: there are four times when we can recur to the Hebrew and Greek founts, as the Fathers urge us to do.

First, when in our codices there seems to be an error of the copyists; thus we see now in the new Missals for Sir. 45:5, *He gave him the commandments face to face* where there is no reason to doubt the meaning: for it was easy to change *ex coram* to *cor ad.* Thus in Sir. 24:30 the words: *I went like the river Diorix* should be changed to *I went forth like a canal from a river,* as it is in the Greek; for Diorix is not the name of any river. For although Rabanus in his commentary on this text says that in the opinion of some there is a river in Armenia which is called Dorix, still he does not prove it by any authority. But the word διώρυξ means a channel leading from a river to irrigate the land.

Thus in Wis. 12:15 *deeming it alien to thy power, you condemn him who does not deserve to be punished;* we see it is corrected not badly in the Louvain Bible in this way, *deeming it alien to thy power to condemn him who does not deserve to be punished,* as it is found to be clear in the Greek. Obviously this is an error of the copyists, although St. Gregory in book 3, chapter 11 of his *Magna Moralia* piously explained the first reading.

Thus in Ps. 42:2 *for God, for the living fountain (fontem),* can safely be changed to *for a strong God;* for in the Hebrew it is clearly ,n □"rfrtf? *for God, for the strong (fortem) living one,* and in Greek it is also πρός τόν θεόν ισχυρόν, where there is no danger of an error. In our version *fortem* could easily be changed to *fontem,* especially since it is preceded by *my soul has thirsted for thee.* Thus also in the revised Missal we see the words in John 19:27, *the disciple took her to his own home* changed from what was formerly *in suam* to *in sua,* since the Greek codex clearly has είς τά ίδια.

Secondly, when the Latin codices vary, so that it cannot be established what the true reading of the Vulgate is, we can go to the sources, and from them get help in order to find the true reading. Thus in Joshua 5:6 some Latin codices have: *To them the Lord swore that he would let them see the land flowing with milk and honey;* but some have, *He swore that he would not let them, etc.* and the true reading seems to be the second one; for, in Hebrew the word "not" is constantly added. As on the other hand in Joshua 11 some codices have: *There was not a city that did not make peace;* but others have, *There was not a city that made peace,* and this is more true, because it agrees with the Hebrew and the following words require it. Also in Luke 1:68 has, *Redemption of his people,* but others have *for his people;* and this seems more correct, since in the Greek it is τώ λαώ αύτου.

Thirdly, when the words or sentence in Latin are not clear, we can refer to the sources,

to see if there is ambiguity there. Thus what we read in Gen. 2:17, *cursed is the ground because of you,* can be understood about future work, that is, when you cultivate it; and of the past, that is, about the sin of Adam because of which the ground is cursed. But in the Hebrew it is not ambiguous, since cannot mean anything except "because of you," that is, because of your sin; hence also St. Jerome says in the Hebrew questions that they translated it correctly who said: *Cursed be the ground because of your transgression.* However, I am not surprised at this, since in Hebrew it could be ζ[ΙΟν3 and by a mistake of the copyist the Daleth was changed to Resh.

Thus also we read in Luke 2:14, *On earth peace to men of good will:* that phrase, *of good will,* is ambiguous, for it can refer to men, and to peace; but from the Greek it is concluded that it is joined better with peace, and so this is the meaning: *on earth peace tomen, the peace,* I mean, of the good will of God towards men. For ένδοκία most often is not the good will of man, but the good will of God towards men. Thus in Ps. 2:11: *Lest he be angry, and you perish in the way; for his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him.* Among Latin theologians there is some doubt whether these words refer to the Father of to the Son, for both are mentioned in the Psalm. But from the Hebrew it is clear that they refer to the Son. Finally, in Ps. 139:14 , *My frame was not hidden from thee,* in Latin there is a doubt whether it is mouth (from *os, oris)* or bone (from *os, ossis).* But in Hebrew it is clear, for it is OXV and not 'D.

Finally in the fourth place, it is right to refer to the sources in order to understand the power and special nature of the words. Thus, the expression in Exod. 1, *He built homes or them,* we understand the phrase to mean fecundity and an abundance of children. There is also the expression in Ps. 113:9, *He gives the barren woman a home;* and this also in Ps. 139:16, *Your eyes beheld my unformed substance,* here the Hebrew word clearly is referring to an unborn child. And in the same place we find the words, *How precious to me are thy thoughts:* from the Hebrew text the meaning is clear, for it means that the knowledge of God is more wonderful than man could ever hope to understand. Also, those who are expert in this language will recognize this kind of Hebraism in the words of St. Paul in Eph. 3:19, *To know the love of Christ which surpasses knowledge.* For here the meaning is not that the love of Christ is a gift greater than knowledge, as the words seem to indicate, but that the love of Christ is greater than what could be comprehended by knowledge.

They derive the third argument from various places, in which it seems to be very clear that the Vulgate edition contains an error. And although they cite those places without any order, nevertheless we will treat them in order. First, we will handle the texts they bring forward from the various books of the Scriptures of the Old Testament; next, what they cite from the Psalms; finally, what they criticize in the New Testament.

CHAPTER XII

THE PLACES IN THE VULGATE EDITION ARE DEFENDED, WHICH KEMNITIUS SAYS HAVE BEEN DISTORTED

First, there is the passage in Gen. 3:15 where we read: *She will bruise your head.* Kemnitius says that this text is corrupt, so that from it the intercession of Mary can be proved, when it should be read as, *He will bruise your head.* For the Scripture is speaking about the seed, that is Christ, as all the ancient authors teach.

I respond that the Vulgate edition has this in different ways; for, some codices have *He* and some have *She.* And so it is not contrary to the Vulgate edition if one is convinced that it should be read *He or She.*

I say secondly that it is not improbable that it should be read *She,* and that this is not a distortion of the Papists. For, although many Hebrew codices have Nin, nevertheless there is one in which it was written R'n , that is, *She,* and also, if the points are omitted, that Hebrew word **NH** can be interpreted as *She,* and it is only the ignorant who do not know this. For passim in the Holy Bible Rin occurs instead of R^n. We find this in Gen. 3:12, Exod. 3:8. You can add to this the fact that Claudius Marius Victor reads it as *She* in book 1 on Genesis, Alcimus Avitus in book 3, chapter 6, Chrysostom in homily 17 on Genesis, Augustine in book 2, chapter 18 on Genesis against the Manicheans and in book 18, chapter 36 in his book on Genesis, Ambrose in chapter 7 of his book on flight from the world, Gregory in book 1, chapter 38 of his Magna Moralia, Eucherius, Rupert, Bede, Rabanus, and Strabo, and Liranus at this place, and Bernard in sermon 2 on *Missus est.* Therefore, what Kemnitius says is a lie, namely, that all the ancient authors read it as *He.*

But you will say: the word *bruise* in Hebrew is in the masculine gender, and therefore it refers to a seed which is also masculine, not to a woman who is feminine. I respond that that is not something new in Scripture, that with feminine names pronouns or verbs are conjugated that are masculine; for example, in Ruth 1:8 Naomi says to her daughters-in-law: DV **'IMO** non DDDV ΠΙΠ' mew'... and many other cases of the same kind are found.

A second place is Gen. 6:5 where we read, *Every thought of his heart was only evil continually;* Kemnitius says that this text has been corrupted in order to weaken original sin, since in Hebrew it is QTn in ρI 1Λ mwna *the imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.* I respond that the meaning is the same. For, *the imagination of his heart* signifies the thoughts of his heart, because it is imagined and formed by the heart, as the Hebrews also teach in this place. And the same thing is: *Every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil, and his imagination,* that is, *the thought of his heart is only evil.* But it does not follow from this, as Luther thought, that all the works of man are evil. For, that is the hyperbole of the Scripture, which it uses often to emphasize some thing. Just as in the same chapter it says: *All flesh had corrupted their way upon the earth,* and nevertheless in the same place it says: *Noah was a righteous man, blameless in his generation.*

The third place is Gen. 9:6 where we read: *Whoever sheds the blood of man, his*

blood will be shed. Kemnitius says that this text has been mutilated, since in Hebrew it reads: *Whoever sheds the blood of man, by man shall his blood be shed.* I respond that this omission does not make the meaning false, nor even imperfect; therefore it is not of great importance. For the meaning is, both in Hebrew and in Latin, *Whoever kills a man, he also will be killed.*

The fourth place in Gen. 14:18: *And Melchizedek king of Salem brought out bread and wine; he was priest of God Most High.* He says that this text has been distorted so that from it we can prove the sacrifice of the Mass; for in Hebrew there is no word of offering, nor any reasonable connection, as in the Vulgate edition.

I respond that Kemnitius claims falsely that there is a word of offering in the Vulgate edition. For, it does not say *he offered (obtulit),* but that *he brought out (protulit) bread and wine.* The Vulgate does have a reasonable connection, but the Hebrew text also has it, although Kemnitius does not see it, either because of his want of skill or he did not want to see it because of malice. For, although in Hebrew there is 'I and not , nevertheless that 'I is often use for '□ as in Isaiah 64:5: *You were angry, and we sinned,* that is, *because we sinned,* where similarly there is 7 for Gen. 20:3: *Behold, you are a dead man, because of the woman you have taken; for she is a man's wife* ΚΙΓΠ. And also in Gen. 30:27, mm 'HITI wm and we find many more places like this in the Hebrew codices.

Therefore Melchizedek brought out bread and wine and offered it to God in sacrifice, because he was priest of God Most High, and by this act he became a type of our sacrifice, in which under the species of bread and wine we offer the body and blood of Christ to God; all the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers affirm this, like Clement of Alexandria in book 4 of the Stromata, Eusebius in book 5, chapter 3 of the Demonstration of the Gospel, Epiphanius in Heresies 79, Chrysostom in homily 35 on Genesis, Cyprian in book 2 of his third letter, Ambrose in book 4, chapter 3 on the Sacraments, Jerome in his commentary on Matt. 26, Augustine in book 18, chapter 17 of *The City of God,* and Eucharius in book 2, chapter 18 on Genesis. Finally, in Ps. 110 it is said of Christ: *You are a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek,* as Paul explains it in Heb. 5 and 7. But why is Christ a priest, and after the order of Melchizedek, unless because he offered bread and wine, here himself under the species of bread and wine?

The fifth place is in Num. 36:6, where we have: *They shall marry within the family of the tribe of their father... and every daughter shall be wife to one of the family of the tribe of her father;* it was not Kemnitius who cited this text, but Osiander in his Annotations and Harmon on the Gospel. For, this precept seems to be contrary to several examples in Scripture. For, Jehoshabeath, the daughter of King Jehoram of the tribe of Judah, was the wife of Jehoiada the priest of the tribe of Levi (2 Chron. 22:11). Ruth, a Moabitess, was the wife of Boaz of the tribe of Judah (Ruth 4:13). Michal of the tribe of Benjamin was the wife of David of the tribe of Judah (1 Sam. 18:27). Likewise all the Hebrews swore in Judges 21:1 that they would not give their daughters as wives to any man from the tribe of Benjamin. Therefore, if there had not been such an oath, it was permitted to give the daughters from one tribe to the men of another tribe. And the Bl. Virgin Mary of the tribe of Judah was related to Elizabeth of the tribe of Levi (Luke 1:36).

Finally, it seems also to be contrary to the Hebrew text, where it says only that

women who are the heirs of paternal goods cannot marry men from another tribe; but concerning men and women who are not heirs there is no law.

Abulensis on this text says that the law did not include the tribe of Levi, nor foreign women and a case of necessity, because great princes and kings could be dispensed from it Thus he responds to all the given examples, but regarding the divine law no one could be dispensed. Then David, when he took Michal as his wife, was not king, nor was his marriage with Michal so necessaiy that because of it he had to be dispensed from the divine law.

Cano in book 2, chapter 14 on this text has a better response, but he does not give a compete explanation. The meaning, therefore, of the law both in the Vulgate and in the Hebrew text is this—that when a woman has no brothers, and therefore is the heir, she cannot marry someone not belonging to her tribe, and no man can take her as his wife, even if she is agreeable, unless he belongs to her tribe. Therefore there is a law, both for men and for women, however it concerns the goods of the woman.

That this is the true meaning of the law is clear from the purpose of the law. For the purpose is, as is stated there, lest inheritances be mixed together, and they be moved from one tribe to another. Then in order to obtain this purpose, it was not necessary to command absolutely that marriages could not take place outside one's own tribe, but only that they could not take place outside the tribe, when the woman to be married is an heiress. And in this way all the alleged examples are answered.

But to the claim that the answer is different in the Hebrew, I respond: it is not true. For the law, given for women in the Hebrew text, is clear also in Latin; but the law given for men, which they say is not found in the Hebrew, is included in these words: ΄Η τηπκ πο» Λπη *For every one of the people of Israel shall cleave to the inheritance of the tribe of his fathers* (Num. 36:7). The adversaries think that the word "cleave" refers to the property, so that the meaning is: *he shall cleave to the property,* that is, *it will remain in the possession of his own tribe,* that is, *it will not be transferred by marriage to the possession of another tribe.* That this is the meaning is gathered from what follows, for it then says: *Every daughter who possesses an inheritance... shall be wife to one of the family of the tribe of her father, etc.* This text was understood in this way by Eusebius in bookl, chapter 6 of his History, Epiphanius in Heresies 78, Ambrose on Luke 3, Bede on Luke 1, Damascene in book 1, chapter 15.

The sixth place is Ezra 9:8 where it says we have *peace in this place,* when it should be a *nail or tent-pin.* I respond that here there is also an error of the copyists; for, the Hebrew word is, Π7', that is, *a nail* or *spike,* and many of the Latin codices have *nail (paxillus).*

The seventh place is Job 5:1. *Call now; is there any one who will answer you? To which of the holy ones will you turn?* Kemnitius says that this text has been corrupted in order to approve the invocation of the saints. I respond that perhaps Kemnitius was intoxicated when he wrote this. For Job 5:1 is most clear in the Hebrew: rwn D'wrpû JJW W'n NJ KIρ which literally means this: *Call now, if there is anyone who will answer you, and look to someone of the saints.* And surely if someone is seeking an explicit word, this is most explicit.

The eighth place is Proverbs 16:11, where we have: *A just balance and scales are the Lord's, and his works are all the weights of the ages;* actually it should be *the weights in*

the bag according to the Hebrew DO which means a *bag* or *purse; not age* which is said with or "TV. I respond that in our edition there are various readings, and that one is correct which has *purse* or *bag;* in other codices because of an error of the copyists the word *age* appears.

The ninth place is Ecclesiastes 9:1: *Man does not know whether it is love or hate.* Kemnitius says that this text has been distorted so that a doubt of faith about the forgiveness of sins can be proved from it; previously Calvin wrote the same thing in chapter 5 § 28 of his Institutes.

I respond that our translator did an excellent job, not by repeating the Hebrew words, but by examining them carefully and expressing their meaning. Thus the Hebrew text says: **ΟΠΙΛ** tan **DTKH** *viv* ρκ **ΠΩΠΚΟΙ,** that is, *whether it is love or hate man does not know, but everything is before their face.* St. Jerome gives the meaning of these words in his commentary on this passage: *Furthermore,* he said, *the meaning is this: I have found that the works of the just are in the hands of God and still, whether they are loved by God or not, now they cannot know; but in the future they will know and everything will be before their face, that is, the knowledge of these things goes before them when they depart from this life, because then is the Judgment, but now is the battle.* That is what he says.

The translator could not have given a better understanding of these words than he did with these words: *Man does not know whether he is worthy of hatred or love, but everything in the future remains uncertain.*

But lest someone object that the impious know that they deserve hatred, it should be noted that the Church is speaking only about the justified who, since they are not aware of any sin in themselves, cannot know with certainty, as long as they are in this life, whether or not they will remain justified. From this it follows that they do not know whether they are deserving of love or hatred.

The tenth place is Ecclesiasticus (Sir.) 5:5: *On the forgiveness of sin do not be without fear.* Kemnitius also says that this text has been distorted in order to prove the uncertainty of the forgiveness of sins. I respond that there are different readings here, as Cornelius Jansen shows in commenting on this text. For, some codices have, *on forgiven sin;* and others, *on the forgiveness of sin,* and this seems to be better, since it agrees more with the Greek text περί εξιλασμού μή άφοβος γίνου.

But the opinion of the heretics is also proved to be false, according to which they say that a man believes for certain that he is justified, or will be justified, if he has faith; for either Wisdom is speaking about a forgiveness already obtained so that it is the same, *on the forgiveness of sin,* and *on forgiven sin;* and then what they say is false, that a man must be certain about his obtained forgiveness; or he is speaking about a forgiveness to be obtained, and again what they say is false—that a man must be certain that he will obtain forgiveness. But this matter will be treated in its proper place.

The eleventh place is Ecclesiasticus (Sir.) 16:14: *He will make room for every act of mercy according to the merit of their works.* Kemnitius complains that we have added the word "merit," which is not in the Greek, and so we have distorted this text in order to show the merit of good works, just as earlier Calvin had complained in chapter 10 § 52 of

his Institutes. I respond that in the Greek text the word "merit" does not appear, because this word is Latin, and the text is in Greek. However, it signifies the same thing, and it is correctly expressed by the word "merit"; for the phrase is κατα έργα, and anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the Greek language cannot deny that κατα έργα means in Latin *according to the merit of their works.*

The twelfth place is Joel 2:13: *He repents of evil.* Kemnitius says that these words have no meaning and that in our Church they are sung without any understanding. I respond that Jerome in his text used this word, and in his Commentary he also used this word, and Kemnitius ought to admit that we attribute more meaning to it than he does. But it means *triumphing over evil, gracious and merciful and ready to forgive,* which is very proper to God. It is the same as that *repenting of evil,* which is found literally in the Hebrew; for, Dm means to repent, *in the niphal tense.* It could also, if we consider the Latin words, *repenting of evil,* properly be the same as *more than what can be overcome by evil.* In fact this is quite true, because the infinite steadfast love of God is never surpassed by the immensity or the number of sins.

The thirteenth place is Micah 5:2, where we read: *But you, O Bethlehem Ephrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me one who is to be ruler in Israel.* Osiander, in his notes on the Harmony of the Gospels, says that this text is corrupt, and should be corrected to: *it is not enough that you are among the clans of Judah, etc.* For he says that an unskilled translator did not know that Hebrew lacks the neuter gender, and that the masculine or feminine is used for it: therefore, although TVS is masculine, it should be translated in the neuter *parum* (= not enough), not as *parvulus* (little). And he proves this, because what follows, *from you shall come forth for me, etc.,* does not rightly agree with what preceded, unless it says, *it is not enough, etc. (parum est, etc.).*

I respond that our translator has translated it correctly; for, the Chaldean and Greek codices agree with him, and Jerome reads it this way in his Commentary on this text, and what is even more important, Matt. 2:6 cites it in this way, for he said, *you are by no means least,* and not, *it is not enough;* and although the Hebrews sometimes use other genders for the neuter, they do not always do so. To prove this I say: the sequence agrees very well with the preceding words, if the preceding are read as an interrogation, as Matthew reads it, and because of that he translates it in the negative: *you are by no means least,* because he read it as *You are small (Parvula es).* But a better response is that Matthew did not cite the words, but the meaning. For, Bethlehem was a small town with regard to the surrounding walls and the number of inhabitants, as the prophet says. And the Evangelist does not deny this; however, it was the greatest city by reason of the privilege of the birth of Christ, which the prophet hints at, when he says: for from you shall come a ruler who will govern my people Israel. The Evangelist is looking at this greatness and for it he added a definite reason, saying: for from you shall come forth, etc. For, that interrogation "Are you small?" is not found in any text—not in Hebrew, not in Greek, not in Latin.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PLACES IN THE PSALMS, WHICH CALVIN CONTENDS WERE BADLY RENDERED BY THE LATIN TRANSLATOR, ARE DEFENDED

Now we will come to those places which John Calvin, in his Antidote to the Council of Trent, says have been corrupted and distorted, and even though before us Gulielmus Lindanus did the same thing in his book on the best kind of translation; however, it does not seem to be useless, if the calumnies of the heretics are refuted by several authors.

Therefore, the first place is in the words in Ps. 2, *Lay hold of discipline (Apprehendite disciplinam).* Calvin shows that this text has been distorted by the error of the translator, since in Hebrew it reads Ί3"Ίρ^3 *Kiss the Son;* and this could not in any way have happened because of the mistake of the copyists, since there is no similarity of the letters.

I respond that in the Hebrew it is literally *kiss,* or *adore the Son;* however, the meaning of this place is rightly translated by *Lay hold of discipline.* For, this is the way the Chaldean translates it, so also the Greek, and this is the way all the ancient Greeks and Latins up to this time have read it. Therefore, it should be noted, when *Kiss the Son* is said, the meaning is: *acknowledge that the Son of God is your King and your Messiah, by kissing his hand as a sign of honor.* This is how St. Jerome explains it in book 1 against Ruffinus; and because of this it can also be translated, *Adore the Son.* Then, of course, the way we can acknowledge that the Son is King and Messiah is by placing Faith in him and his teaching. And what else is *Lay hold of discipline,* but *to accept the knowledge and teaching of the Son of God?*

The second place is Ps. 4:3: *O men, how long shall my honor suffer shame?* In the same place Calvin criticizes this text, because there is nothing like it in the Hebrew; for our words, *how long shall my honor suffer shame,* in Hebrew reads: πΛΛ HW *my glory into shame.*

I respond that it is veiy probable that the Hebrew text has been corrupted by the error of the copyists; for if □ is changed to □ , and the points are changed, it becomes, *how long shall my honor suffer shame,* that is, like this: πΛ Λ 'TOD and without doubt that is the way the Septuagint authors read it and their version was followed by all the Greek and Latin Fathers, except Jerome, who although he read it differently, translated it as *my honor.* However, the meaning is the same, which suffices for the truth of the translation. For, in that place God is complaining about men, because they neglect eternal things and love what is temporal; and indeed according to the Greek and Latin version he calls them "heavy at heart," because that is what they are because of their sin. But according to the Hebrew, as we just said, he calls them his glory, or his honor, because they are such because of the divine beneficence, if we consider in them the heavenly image, and not their own sin. Then that 'TOD can be either the passive participle of the verb HDD or a verbal noun.

The third place is Ps. 32:4: *I have been changed in my toil, while I am pierced through with a nail.* Calvin also criticizes this text, because in Hebrew the words are different, and the sense is different. For, in Hebrew literally it is: *My moisture is turned*

into the drought of summer. And the sense of our version is: *I have been converted to penance in a time of hardship and affliction, while the thorn of calamity began to be fixed in me;* however, the meaning of the Hebrew text is, *All my bones were perishing, as the moisture and verdure in summer are dried out and perish from the heat of the Sun.*

I respond that our translator cannot be rebuked in this place, since he is not translating from Hebrew, but he is translating from Greek to Latin. But the Greek text agrees very well with our text. It seems that the LXX translators read a Hebrew text somewhat different from what we have; therefore it was an error of the Hebrew copyists. For, with a slight change of one or two letters it can happen that there is in Hebrew the meaning of our version. For the words nwl? ηαη is translated as *my verdure;* but if the words are read as nwb TODm then it will be, *I have been changed in my toil,* just as St. Jerome reads it and translates it as: *I have been tormented in my misery.* And what follows pp *into the drought of summer,* if is read as yip Ounna it will be, *while I am pierced through with a nail.*

And certainly, if, when we see in a Latin text that something could easily be changed by the copyists because of the similarity of the letters, and that it could not be such in the Hebrew, we say that the error or the copyists is in the Latin: so why can we not say here, where there could easily be an error in the Hebrew, and not in the Greek or Latin, that in the Hebrew, because of an error of the copyist, the text has been changed?

The fourth place is in the same Psalm (32:9), for there we read: *whose mouth must be held in with bit and bridle, lest they come near unto thee.* Calvin says that it should read: *restrain them with sharp points and a bridle lest they come near to you.* I respond that his impudence in this matter is amazing. For, both the LXX and St. Jerome in his psalter given to Sophronius, and all the Fathers have always read this as we now read it: and the Hebrew words, even as they now are, can fittingly be explained in this way.

The fifth place is in Psalm 38:7: *My loins are filled with burning.* And Calvin asks: What do we understand by loins filled with burning? I respond that the Hebrew word nbp] means disgrace or burning. Therefore David is speaking about the itch and ardor of passion which, as long as it exists in the body, generates a burning in the mind. Also I respond that the Greek translator, whom the Latin and (which is even more amazing) the Chaldean followed, put down the effect for the cause, which ought not to seem new or strange to anyone.

The sixth place is Ps. 68:6: *God gives the desolate a home to dwell in.* Calvin says it should read: *God gives the solitaries a home to dwell in,* that is, *he provides a family for orphans and the lonely.* I respond that the Hebrew words here can have several meanings, and all of them are true. One meaning is: *those in their own home,* which is the Church, *he makes those men dwell who are of one mind,* that is, of one Faith, of one hope, of one will, according to Acts 4:32: *Now the company of those who believed were of one heart and soul.* For those who are of a different Faith or will, like the heretics and schismatics, cannot remain in the Church, but they either leave or are expelled. The LXX elders expressed this meaning, and they were followed by the Latin translators, and almost all the Greek and Latin Fathers. And this meaning does not depart from the Hebrew, for τηl comes from the verb TTP which means "to unite," then it become TTP "united,"

or one composed out of many. But since it also means "unique" and "lonely," then the other meaning is also true; *who sees to it that abandoned and lonely men, who do not have anyone to defend them, nevertheless can dwell secure in their homes, because they are protected by the divine assistance,* St. Jerome seems to have looked at it in this way, and so he translated it as *lonely.* A third meaning is also true, and it does not negate the others: *God gives the single men,* that is, *orphans and the sterile a home to dwell in,* that is, he makes a large family out of them.

And the explanation is not absurd of those who translate it like this: *He gives the lonely a home to dwell in,* that is, *He brings it about that certain ones, having left society for the love of heavenly contemplation, betake themselves to deserted places and live alone,* like formerly Elijah, and after him John the Baptist, and our Paul, Anthony, Hilary, and others have done.

The seventh place is in the same Psalm (68:7), where for what we have: *who dwell in cemeteries,* Calvin contends that it should read *in a parched land.* And surely it cannot be denied that the Hebrew word nmnx designates a thirsty and dry place; but it is not credible that the Greek translator did not know that, since it is a well-known word. Therefore, the translator wanted to express the horror of that wilderness, from which God brought out his people; and so it seems to be like a sepulcher. We see that Ezekiel used this expression in chapter 37 where he calls the Babylonian captivity the graveyard of the Jews.

The eighth place is in the same Psalm (68:11-13) where it says: *The Lord gives the command; great is the host of those who bore the tidings: The Kings of the armies, they flee, they flee! The women at home divide the spoil, though they stay among the sheepfolds—the wings of a dove covered with silver, its pinions with green gold.* Calvin misuses this place more than others, when he says that the translator, where the sense flows well in David's words, makes use of enigmas, from which no Oedipus could free himself. So he wants it to read like this: *The Kings of the armies fled, they fled, and the inhabitants of the homes have divided the spoil. If you stay among the jars, you will be like the feathers of a dove, covered with silver, and whose wings are covered with yellow gold.* I respond that the Latin translator cannot be blamed, because he translated faithfully what he found in the Greek. And although in the Latin version this passage is very obscure, nevertheless it is also obscure in the Greek and in the Hebrew, and in Calvin's version, as is clear.

Moreover, I say that the Hebrew text can be accommodated to our reading. For, for that mxnx *'my* signifies *the Kings of hosts, that is, of armies;* however, if the points are changed, and we read nixas 'Λ» it will be *the King of virtues,* like pTS Oba *the King of justice.* And that pm means *they will flee;* but in the LXX it is read as mm with the change of only one letter, which means *beloved;* this word is found in the title of Psalm 45 where it is called a song of love. But the word ma m3 means *the woman at home,* and not *the inhabitants,* as Calvin wrongly translates it; it also means a beautiful and charming woman, who almost always stays at home. And when it is translated in that way it signifies beautiful in appearance. Thus St. Jerome translates it here as *beautiful,* and elsewhere almost always with the same word.

Finally, the word □'Dnw, does not mean *jars,* as Calvin thinks, for it is in the dual

number, and therefore it signifies something by its nature that is doubled; for in this way the Hebrews almost always use the dual number. The word "jars" is indefinite; but it also means two lips, or two ends or orders; for naw means *to order.* Hence St. Jerome translates it as *among ends;* and the LXX has *among the clergy,* that is, *the lots,* or *the inheritances,* as if he were to say, *Among the end of two lots.* Therefore we have that our reading is not different from the Hebrew text. Now we will explain the meaning.

Therefore the meaning of these words, as gathered from Augustine and from other Fathers, is this: *The Lord will give the work to those evangelizing with great power,* that is, *the Lord will give to the preachers of the Gospel a mouth and wisdom, which all their adversaries will not be able to resist or contradict.* For, what they say will be confirmed also by signs and miracles. *The King of armies, they flee, they flee,* that is, *the Lord,* whom we were talking about, *is the King of powers,* that is, *a powerful King, the Lord of many armies of thousands of angels, and at the same time he is the father of the beloved, of the beloved,* that is, *of the Mass of his beloved Son; he will also allow the woman of the house to divine the spoil,* that is, *he will grant to the same preachers the right to divide the spoils of the Gentiles converted to Christ, for the beauty and adornment of his house, which is the Church.* For the word "beauty" *(specie)* is in the dative case, and it means the same things as "for the beauty." *The women at home divide the spoil,* that is, *If you, O Preachers and Pastors of the Church, stay among the two lots, or inheritances, the heavenly and the earthly, so that while you live here, you are not totally occupied with temporal things, nor totally in action, nor totally in contemplation, but in the middle, then the Church will be like a well formed and beautiful dove with wings of silver and a golden back, etc.*

The ninth place is in the same Psalm (68:16) where we read: *Why do you look at the many-peaked mountains?* For Calvin thinks it should be read as *why do you look with envy at the splendid mountains;* but since the verb 7XI is found only in this place, there are almost as many explanations of this verb as there are commentators. Why, I ask, should the one man Campensis be followed, rather than the translators of the Septuagint? Certainly Calvin could not confirm his version from any other source than Campensis. Therefore, since it is necessary to accept the judgment of the translators, who does not see that the LXX translators should be preferred to all others, especially since the Catholic Church has approved their translation by using it for such a long time?

The tenth place is in the same Psalm (68:18): *For the non-believers dwell in the Lord God.* But Calvin says it should be read as *Even among the rebellious, that the Lord may dwell there.* But really this desire to contradict is too much, since the meaning is the same, and the words of the Vulgate translation are better; also, St. Jerome translated it from the Hebrew as: *The non-believers dwell in the Lord God.*

The eleventh place is in the same Psalm (68:22) where we read: *I will turn around in the depths of the sea.* For Calvin says that in the Hebrew it is the contrary, that is: *I will bring them back from the depths of the sea.* But first of all, R. David says that it can properly be translated from the Hebrew as *in the depths of the sea;* and he says that sometimes ns is usurped by □ , as in Deut. 33:2 'TOB *In Sinai.* The there are various readings both in the Greek and in the Latin codices, since some say *in the depth* and

others say *in the depths.* This latter reading seems to be more true, and it agrees well with the Hebrew word. For, what else is *I will turn around in the depths of the sea,* othert than *I will extract those also who are in the depths of the sea, and I will convert them?* In this way Augustine, Bede, Euthymius and not a few others have explained it.

The twelfth place is in the same Psalm (68:27). *There is Benjamin in the departure of his mind.* Calvin wonders what the translator was thinking, who used these words, since in Hebrew it is DTH, that is, *their ruler.* I respond that that word can signify *their ruler* from the verb τη and also *sleeping deeply* from the verb τη; the Greek and Latin translators used the latter reading, but both are a true interpretation, nor does either one negate the other. For, by the word "Benjamin" Catholic authors, with Augustine, understand the Apostle Paul, who was in a departure from his mind, and sleeping so deeply, that he did not know whether he was in the body, and at the same time he was the principal Lord, or spiritual ruler of the Church of the Gentiles.

The thirteenth place is Ps. 132:15, where we read: *Blessing I will bless her widow.* Both Calvin and Kemnitius say that this text is corrupt, since in Hebrew it is HTX, that is, *her provisions.* Calvin adds that a dim-sighted priest had in his codex the word *Victum,* and he thought that the "c" and "t" were joined to make a "d," and therefore he read *Vidum;* and because this word does not mean anything, he added an "a" and changed the word to *Viduam* (widow); and he says there was no one who could detect this error.

I respond that Calvin in lying twice in this place. First, when he says that no one detected this change, for it was noted by Chrysostom and Hilary concerning this text, and also by St. Jerome on the book of Genesis. Likewise there are several contemporaries who point this out, like Cajetan, Titelmanus, and others concerning this place. Secondly, when he says that a dim-sighted priest distorted this verse, for this difference took its origin not from Latin, but from Greek. For, in almost all the Greek codices the word is χήραν, that is *widow,* and that is the way it was read by Ambrose, Hilary, Augustine, Chiysostom, Prosper, Cassiodorus, and others. Also, St. Hilary says that, before Christ was bom, the word in this text was χήραν, that is, *widow.*

Moreover, I say: if there is an error here, it is in the Greek; for, between χήραν and Θήραν there is a difference of only one letter, and it could easily have happened that some wrote χήραν for Θήραν. For even now some Greeks have Θήραν and Jerome in his Psalter translates it as veneiy, and Chrysostom and Theodoretus in comments on this text explain it this way.

However, because the meaning is almost the same, and in the Greek and Latin Church it has always been read and sung as *widow,* I do not think this text should be changed. For, Jerome, in his letter to Suniam and Fratellam, wisely says that the things in the Latin Psalms, that seem to differ from the Hebrew, surely should be noted and pointed out by the learned, but that the text should not therefore be changed, which has been used in the Church for so many centuries and has acquired such great authority. Calvin in no way observed this advice of Jerome and he so transposed and changed everything that he produced a completely different Psalter.

In conclusion, it seems proper to quote some words of Conrad Pellicanus, a Zwinglian, so that we can truly say about our version what Moses said about the true God: our

version is not like theirs, and our enemies are the judges of that. Therefore, when he had published twice the Psalter which was translated by him form the Hebrew, he had this to say about our Psalter in the preface to his 1534 edition: *We understand that the Vulgate edition of the Psalter agrees with the meaning of the Hebrew text with such dexterity, erudition and faith, that I do not doubt that the Greek and Latin translator, as both erudite and devout, was endowed with a prophetic spirit; although in some places they differ from the Hebrew points, which the Jews use, which I am forced to admit formerly were not similar, and for those who study the matter carefully there is a suspicion that a change in some of the letters had been made.* That is what he has to say. For now, that is enough about the Old Testament.

CHAPTER XIV

THE PLACES ARE DEFENDED WHICH THE HERETICS SAY HAVE BEEN CORRUPTED IN THE LATIN EDITION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Then in the New Testament Kemnitius and Calvin say that there are not a few places that have been corrupted by the Latin translator.

The first place is Matt. 9:13, *I came not to call the righteous, but sinners.* Kemnitius says that a beautiful sentence has been mutilated, because in Latin the word "repentance" is missing. I respond that in some Latin codices that word is found; and then I say it is probable that in Greek that word is superfluous, and in the emended Greek codices it is not found. For, St. Jerome in his commentary does not mention it, and nevertheless carefully compared the Greek with the Latin, and he corrected the Latin from the Greek. But it is obvious that here this is not necessary. For to call sinners, not the righteous, clearly means to exhort to repentance those who need it, not those who do not need it, which the Lord had just explained with the example of the doctor.

The second place is John 14:26, *The Holy Spirit will bring to your remembrance all that I have said to you.* Kemnitius says that this text has been distorted in order to prove that whatever is defined by a Council must be accepted as an oracle of the Holy Spirit; for, in Greek it is not *I shall have said (dixero),* but *I have said (dixi),* είπον ύμϊν. I respond that St. Augustine and other ancient authors read it just as we do, and that the meaning is the same in the Greek. For we do not understand that the Lord said, *the Holy Spirit will bring to your remembrance what I shall have said to you then;* but *what I shall have said now,* that is, *all that you hear from me now, and do not understand, then the Holy Spirit will recall it to your memory and will explain it.* Also, Catholics do not base the foundation of the authority of Councils on this text, but we have other supports for it, which will be presented later.

The third place is Rom. 1:4, *who was predestined Son of God.* Calvin criticizes this verse as being badly translated: both because in Greek it is όρισθέντος, that is, *declared w manifested,* and because those are predestined who do not exist, but Christ always was the Son of God. Origen also uses this argument for this text.

I respond that our translator has given an excellent rendition; for although the Greek word όρίζειν means *to finish,* and among profane authors it is often used in the sense *oï declare,* nevertheless in Scripture it is used differently. For, as Dionysius teaches in chapter 5 of his book on the Divine Names, this word is a proper term in Theology, that is, in Scripture it has a special meaning; for, everywhere it signifies *to constitute, to decree, to define,* but it never means *to declare,* as is clear in Acts 2,4,17, Rom. 8, Eph. 1 and elsewhere. For when it is said in Acts 2:23, *this Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God, you crucified...,* this phrase is used ώρισμενή βουλή; and certainly it does not mean a "declaration," but a divine ordination. Similarly, in Rom.8:30, *those whom he predestined, he also called,* in Greek is προώρισμεν; and not even the adversaries claim that this word means "he declared."

And since the ordination and definition of God cannot be temporal, but is eternal,

therefore out translator, seeing that the Apostle was speaking about eternal destination, preferred to translate it as *predestination* rather than *destination.* And in this way also all the ancient Latin authors read it, like Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 32 against Valentinus, Hilary in book 3 on the Trinity, Ambrose, Sedulius, and others on this place, Augustine in chapter 15 of his book on predestination, and in tract 105 on John. Tertullian in his book against Praxeas reads it as *defined,* which is the same as our reading. Add the Council of Toledo XI (chapter 1), which both reads and explains *predestined.* Nor does the petty syllogism of Calvin prove anything; for we are not saying that it was predestined that the eternal Word of God would begin to be the Son of God, but that the Word of God would become man, and therefore that he who was made by God from the seed of David, as Paul says, would be the Son of God, a point which is beautifully explained by Augustine and the Council of Toledo.

The fourth place is Rom. 1:32, where we have: *Though they know God's decree that those who do such things deserve to die, they not only do them but approve those who practice them.* Not only Kemnitius, but also Valla, Erasmus, Jacob Faber, and others say that this part of the letter is corrupt. First, since the Greek text has this wording: οἵτινες τό δικαίωμα τού θεού ἐπιγνόντες, ότι οί τά τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες ἄξιοι θανάτου εἰσίν, ού μόνον αύτα ποιοϋσιν, ἀλλα καί συνευδοκοϋσιν τοίς πράσσουσιν. Therefore, first of all, in our Latin codex the words have been added "they did not understand," then that "who," when it is said "those who do such things," and "those who practice them." Secondly, because Chrysostom, Oecumenius and Theophylact explain it as it is given in Greek. Thirdly, because what is given in our text seems to be false, or certainly not very probable. For it says: *Those who, since they knew the justice of God, did not understand that those who do such things deserve to die, etc.* For, if they did not understand, how did they know the justice of God? For, what is the justice of God, except that the one who does evil will be punished?

I respond that our reading is much better; for, according to the Greek the meaning is, *it is worse to approve of one doing evil, than it is to do evil.* According to the Latin, the meaning is just the opposite, *it is worse to do evil than it is to approve those who do evil.* But certainly, absolutely it is worse to do evil than it is to approve of those who do evil. For, who will deny that it is worse to kill a man than it is just to approve of the killing of a man, that is, to permit it, when you could impede it? For here the Apostle is not talking about the command, or the incitement to evil, but about the simple consent.

Therefore, in answer to the first reason given above I say: we cannot deduce anything for certain in this part from the Greek source, for the reading varies in the Greek codices. For Origen reads it differently than Chrysostom does, as is clear from their Commentaries, and Oecumenius says some of the codices had what we now have. Titelmannus also in his commentary on Rom. 1 says that he read in an old Greek codex the words ού συνηκαν, that is, *they did not understand.*

For the second point we oppose authors to authors; for, the following read it, as we have, and explain it: Cyprian in book 2 of letter 4, Ambrose, Sedulius Haymo, Anselm, and other Latins commenting on this text, Hesychius in book 6 on Levitus, explaining chapter 20, and Pope Symmachus in his Apologetics against the Emperor Anastasius.

On the third point I say: what is said in Greek is what seems to be false; for, what is said in Latin, *Since they knew the justice of God,* does not conflict with what follows, *they did not understand.* For when he says *they knew it,* he is speaking about theoretical knowledge; when he says *they did not understand,* he is speaking about the practical order. Therefore the meaning is, *Since they knew the truth, nevertheless blinded by their morally disordered passions, they could not in earnest persuade themselves that it should be done in this way.* It could also be said that the phrase *they did not understand* does not refer to the words, *because those who do such things, etc.,* but rather to *but they approve those who practice them.* For the meaning is: *the pagan philosophers, since they knew there is only one God, and therefore that it is evil to worship Jove and Mars, and the other false gods, did not understand, not only that what the crowds were doing was evil, but also that it is evil to approve such things, and not to warn them and denounce what the philosophers were doing.*

The fifth place is Rom. 4:2, where it is said that Abraham was not justified by works. For, Kemnitius complains that we added the words "of the law," so we could explain that place to be about the works of the law of the one who prescribed those ceremonies. I respond that this is a pure calumny. For the Latin codices, either all or almost all do not contain that phrase "of the law." And we do not understand that text to be about the works of the old law, but about the works done by one's own efforts. Additionally, there is the fact that Ambrose also in this text has the words "of the law," and in his commentary he explains it as being about the old law. Therefore, the papists did nor corrupt this text, as Kemnitius says falsely. But there will be more about this later.

The sixth place in Rom. 11:6, where we read: *But if it is by grace, it is no longer on the basis of works; otherwise grace would no longer be grace.* Kemnitius calumniates us by claiming we altered the sentence from what it was originally: *But if it is by works, it is no longer grace, otherwise the work would no longer be a work.*

I respond: indeed that sentence is in the Greek, and it is explained by Theophlact, but it is not acknowledged by any of the other authors. For, neither Origen, nor Chrysostom, nor Ambrose, nor any other commentators on this text mention it. Neither does St. Augustine, who treated this text frequently, and especially in book 2, chapter 18 in his book on the good of perseverance. Indeed even Erasmus in his Commentary on this verse rejects this change as superfluous. Certainly this should be enough for Kemnitius, who on the same page gives a reference to Erasmus so that we might find out about the errors of the Vulgate.

The seventh place is Eph. 5:32, *This is a great sacrament.* For, Kemnitius teaches that *Sacrament* here has been badly translated, since in Greek the word is μυστήριον, and he says that his was done by us, so that we might be able from it to prove that matrimony is a Sacrament. I respond that the word "mystery" is the same as "sacrament" in Latin. For, when the Greeks consider the sacraments, they always call them μυστήρια. And when the holy Fathers, Ambrose, Jerome, and other Latins, are explaining this text of the Apostle, they always use this word.

The eighth place is Eph. 6:11, *Put on the whole armor of God, that you may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil... and having done all, to stand.* Kemnitius says

that this text has been distorted, because in the Greek it is *having done all well* ἅπαντα κατεργασάμενοι, and Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, and others, explain it in this way. I respond that the meaning is the same, but it is necessary to join the words "having done well" with the word "all," and not with "to stand." For, the meaning of the Apostle is: *we should be armed in every way with spiritual weapons, so that being thus armed we can do battle against the Devil, and not fall but stand.* Therefore he says, *Put on the armor of God,* in Greek πανοπλίαν, that is, all the weapons—helmet, shield, sword, breastplate, etc., *so that having done all well,* that is, *defended and armed in every way,* that is, *having been perfected and endowed with every virtue, you may be able to stand against the Devil;* or, and it is the same, *so that made perfect in all things,* that is, *since you have all the weapons and have put them on, then you will be able to stand, etc.*

The ninth place is Heb. 9:28, *to bear the sins of many.* Kemnitius claims that the Greek words have been badly translated, for ἀνενεγκεῖν does not mean "to bear" but "to take way." I respond that in this text the meaning is the same. Moreover, the translator seems to have translated it correctly; for, ἀναφέρω means *to carry up, to carry away, to draw out.* Therefore, just as when water or the dregs are drawn out of a container, the dregs are said to be taken away, so also the sins, which Christ removed and took away from the depths of our heart, are said to have been borne by him.

The tenth place is Heb. 13:16, *for such sacrifices are pleasing to God.* Kemnitius says that the notion of merit has been introduced here and that it does not occur in the Greek. I respond: the Greek phrase εὐαρεστεῖται ὁ θεός, means that *God is pleased,* or, as Erasmus translates it, *it is pleasing to God.* But there is no one who does not know that in Latin it is rightly said that someone deserves a reward when he has done something pleasing to another. Therefore our translator said *such sacrifices are pleasing to God,* that is, *with these sacrifices something has been done pleasing to God, and the one who offers them deserves a reward from God.* For the translator puts the idea of merit in a passive meaning.

The eleventh place is James 5:15, *and the Lord will raise him up.* Kemnitius says that the Greek word ἐγερει was not translated well, and that the text has been skillfully distorted, so that from it we can demonstrate the effects of the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, since there is nothing corresponding to it in the Greek.

I respond that Kemnitius does not know what he is talking about. For, the Greek word better shows the effects of the Extreme Unction, which Catholics acknowledge in this Sacrament, than the Latin word does. For Catholics attribute three effects to this Sacrament. There is one in particular, common to other Sacraments, namely, the forgiveness of sins, if any are present. The second thing proper to this Sacrament is that it raises up and cheers the sick and dying man who may be mentally confused and burdened with sadness and sufferings. Thirdly, sometimes it also confers healing of the body.

James clearly mentions these three effects, beginning with the less important, with these words: *Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith will save the sick man, and the Lord will raise him up; and if he has committed sins, he will be forgiven.* Very properly, then, the word ἐγείρω, that is, *I stir up, I raise*

up, etc., expresses the second effect of this Sacrament, so that a man at the moment of death, depressed and disturbed by sadness, sufferings and temptations may be raised up, encouraged and cheered.

The twelfth place is 1 John 5:13: *I write this to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal life.* Kemnitius says that this sentence has been mutilated, for in the Greek it reads like this: *I write to you who believe in the name of the Son of God, that you may know that you have eternal life, and that you may believe in the name of the Son of God.* I respond: the Latin codex is not mutilated, but the Greek is redundant, as even Erasmus suspected in his comments on this text, and Kemnitius is wont to attribute much authority to his judgment. For, when it was said, *I write this to you who believe in the name of the Son of God,* why are the words repeated, *that you may believe in the name of the Son of God? Why was it necessary to warn them to do what they had already done?* You can add to this also the fact that Bede reads the verse as we have it.

CHAPTER XV

ON THE VERNACULAR EDITIONS

There is a controversy between Catholics and heretics about whether it is necessary, or certainly helpful that there should be the common use of the divine Scriptures in the vernacular languages that are spoken in each region. All the heretics of this time agree that it is necessary to permit the use of the Scriptures to all, and indeed to translate them into their own language, and when they are read in public or sung, as in the Divine Office, that it should be done in their own maternal language. Brentius teaches this in the Confession of Wirtenberg in the chapter on the Canonical Hours, Calvin in book 3, chapter 20 § 33 of his Institutes, Kemnitius in his examination of session 4 of the Council of Trent. All the others really teach the same thing, since passim they translate the Scriptures into German, French, English, and they read and sing the Scriptures publicly in the same languages.

But the Catholic Church of Christ does not actually forbid completely all vernacular translations, and Kemnitius impudently lies about this, since in the Index of forbidden books published by Pius IV [rule #4] we see that the reading of such books is granted to those who, usefully and with fruit, can use them, that is, to those who have received permission from their ordinary. But what is forbidden is that passim the reading of such books should be permitted to all without discrimination, and that in public or *in the common use of the Church* the Scriptures should not be read or sung in the vernacular languages, as the Council of Trent decreed in session 22, chapter 8, canon 9. But we are content with those three languages which the Lord honored in the title on his cross [John 19:20], and which by the consent of all, by their antiquity, distribution and gravity are preferable to all others. Finally, it was in these languages that the divine books in the beginning were written by their authors, that is, Hebrew, Greek and Latin. About them St. Hilary says this in his preface to the Psalms: *It is especially in these three languages that the mystery of the will of God and the expectation of the heavenly kingdom is preached, in them the title of Pilate was written, so that in these three languages the Lord Jesus Christ should be declared the King of the Jews.*

Two authors, whom I know, wrote about this argument, namely, Hosius Cardinal Varmiensis in the Dialogue on the sacred reading in the vernacular, and Jacob Ledesma, a priest of our Society, in a book which he wrote on this same point. We will borrow a few things from them, and we will add them to our argumentation so that it will be more complete.

At the beginning, therefore, of the Catholic Church we can prove that there was the custom from the use of the Church of the Old Testament, which lasted from the time of Ezra until Christ. For, from the time of Ezra the Hebrew language ceased to be the common language of the people of God, since during the 70 years when the Hebrews lived among the Chaldeans in Babylon, they forgot their own language and they learned Chaldean, and afterwards Chaldean, or Aramaic was their mother tongue; this is reported in Neh. 8:7-8, because when the book of the law of the Lord was read to the entire people by Nehemiah, Ezra and the Levites translated for him, since otherwise the people would

not have understood him. Therefore it is said in the same place that there was great joy among the people, because they understood the words of the law, while Ezra did the translating.

Furthermore, that is easily gathered from the words of Christ and the Evangelists. For, in Mark 5:41 he said, *Talitha cumi,* that is, *Little girl, I say to you, arise,* is Aramaic. For, a little girl in Hebrew is not *Talitha,* but or HTO; so also *Abba* in Mark 14:36, because the word is 3K in Hebrew. And in Matt. 27:8 the word Haceldama is Aramaic, and in Hebrew it is called Dinitz. In the same place *Golgatha* is Aramaic; in Hebrew it is called ΛΛα, and in all the Gospels we have the word *Pasch,* which is not Greek, nor is it Hebrew; in Hebrew it is called **ROD.** You will find more about this in Jerome's book on Hebrew words. Therefore, there can be no doubt but that during this time the common language was not Hebrew, and nevertheless they read and sang publicly the Scriptures in the temple and in the synagogues only in Hebrew. For, from Neh. 8:7-8 it is sufficiently evident that then the Scripture was read in Hebrew, not in Aramaic, because the people did not understand it without a translator. And what John says in 7:49 applies here: *this crowd, who do not know the law.*

Finally, to this day in the synagogues the Jews read the Scriptures in Hebrew, even though in no nation at this time is Hebrew the common language. And this is not contradicted by the fact that an Aramaic translation of the Scriptures exists; for, either totally or for the most part it was produced after the coming of Christ, and also the Hebrews have never accepted it in such a way that they read it in public for the Scriptures; that is what we are considering here.

Secondly, it is proved from the praxis of the Apostles. For, the Apostles preached the Gospel in the whole world, and they established Churches, as is clear from Paul in Romans 10 and Colossians 1, and from Mark 16. Similarly, we find the same thing in book 1, chapter 3 of Irenaeus who, since he was very close to the apostolic times, still says that at his time there were Churches already established in the East, in Libya, in Egypt, in Spain, in Germany, and in the middle regions, that is, Italy and France. Nevertheless, they did not write the Gospels or Epistles in the languages of those nations, where they preached, but only in Hebrew, or Greek, and, as some claim, in Latin. For, there are those who think that Mark's Gospel, as we mentioned above, was composed in Latin in Rome by Mark himself, and afterwards was translated by him into Greek. On this matter, see Damasus on the life of St. Peter, Adrian Finus in book 6, chapter 80 of his treatise on the Jews, and Peter Antonius Beuter in his commentary 9 on Holy Scripture.

But that they did not write in any other languages, although they were not ignorant of them, since they had the gift of languages, can be shown in many ways. First, because there does not exist a trace of any other apostolic writing except in Greek; nor does any of the ancients say that he wrote anything except in Hebrew, or in Greek, or in Latin. Moreover, Paul wrote to the Romans in Greek, even though for the Romans the common language was Latin, not Greek. Similarly, Peter and James wrote in Greek to the Jews dispersed throughout the whole world, though for them Greek was not the mother tongue, nor Hebrew, but the language of the region where they lived, as is clear from what is said in Acts 2:7, *Are not all those who are speaking Galileans? And how is it that*

we *hear, each of us in his own native language?* For this is said by the Jews, who came from different regions to the city of Jerusalem. Thus Luke says in 2:5, *Now there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven.* Likewise, John wrote his first letter in Greek to the Parthians, as St. Higinus says in his first letter, and St. Augustine in book 2, question 39 in his Gospel Questions, and Pope John II in his letter to Valerius, even though Greek was not the mother tongue of the Parthians.

Thirdly, it is proved from the use of the universal Church. For, as Augustine teaches in letter 118, to argue against what the whole Church does is arrogant madness; further, the whole Church has always used only these languages—Hebrew, Greek and Latin—in her common and public use of the Scriptures, even though in the course of time they had ceased to be the vernacular languages.

That this is the case is now proved. First, from the fact that St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 11 of his book on Christian Doctrine says that for an understanding of Scripture it is necessary to know only three languages—Hebrew, Greek and Latin, because divine Scripture is read in those languages, and no ancient author speaks about any other translation; nevertheless, at that time certainly there were many other vernacular languages. Therefore at least for the first 400 years, in which the Church was flourishing, the Scriptures were not read in the vernacular language. Then according to the rule of Augustine in book 4, chapter 24 against the Donatists and Leo in sermon 2 on the Pentecost Fast, what was observed in the whole Church, if it cannot be determined that its beginning comes down from the apostolic tradition, and so it is believed to have always been done rightly; but we see now that in Italy, Germany, France, Spain, Greece, and wherever Catholics are that there is a great use in the public reading of Scripture of Greek and Latin, and the beginning of this matter cannot be determined. So who can say when this custom began?

On this point, in the whole Orient, during the time of St. Jerome, in public the only edition used was the Greek translation of the LXX as emended by Origen, Lucianus and Hesychius. For, as we learn from Jerome in his preface to Chronicles, from Constantinople to Antioch the Greek edition of Lucianus was the one used in public; from Antioch to Egypt, that is, throughout Syria, the edition of Origen was the one used; in all of Egypt they used the edition of Hesychius. Nevertheless the Greek language was not the popular language from Constantinople to Antioch, and much less in Syria and Egypt. For Galatia is between Constantinople and Syria, still the common language at the time of St. Jerome was not Greek, but another tongue similar to the language of the Trevirians, as Jerome says in the preface of book 2 on the letter to the Galatians.

Furthermore, Pontus, Cappadocia, Asia Minor, Phrygia, Pamphilia are located between Constantinople and Antioch, but still they did not have the same common language, but different ones, as is evident from Acts 2, but nevertheless they all used the same edition of the Scriptures, namely, that of St. Lucianus. In Syria, however, at the same time, the common language was not Greek, but another very different language, according to St. Jerome in his life of Hilary, where he says that Hilary asked a certain inhabitant first in Aramaic and then in Greek, whether the Greeks who were present could understand him. Also St. Ephraem wrote many things in the Aramaic language, that is,

in his own vernacular language, as St. Jerome reports in his Catalogue of the Scriptures.

Athanasius says in his life of St. Anthony that Egypt also had its own language; there he says that Anthony with the help of a translator debated with some Greek philosophers. Also, St. Jerome says in his book on famous men, in the chapter on Anthony, that he wrote some letters in Egyptian, which afterwards were translated into Greek.

It is also certain in Africa, wherever Christians were, that the Latin language only was always used in the public reading of the Scriptures; for, there is no mention by any author of a Punic translation. And St. Augustine in book 2, chapter 13 of his book on Christian Doctrine says that at his time the custom was to sing the Psalms in Church in Latin. Similarly, St. Cyprian in a sermon on the Lord's Prayer says that at his time the custom was to sing at Mass the introductory verse, *Sursum corda.* St. Augustine in chapter 13 of his treatise on perseverance says that in the Mass, after the words *Habemus ad Dominum,* immediately was added by the priest, *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro,* and the response was, *Dignum et justum est.* From these facts it is clearly concluded that in Africa the Mass usually was said in Latin, and also the reading of the Epistle and the Gospel, which belong to the main parts of the Mass.

But the same Augustine maintains that at that time Latin was not the common language in Africa; for, at the beginning of his commentary on the letter to the Romans he says that the word *Salvation (Salus)* is also a Punic word, and that in Punic it means three things; and in the same place he says that some persons knew Latin and Punic, and that others knew only Punic, and of these almost all of them were peasant farmers. Likewise in sermon 35 on the word of God he says that the Punic language is related to Hebrew, and what the Romans call *riches,* is called *mammon* by the Carthaginians. Also St. Jerome in the preface of book 2 on the letter to the Galatians says that the language of the Africans is the language of Phoenicia which has been changed somewhat. But Phoenicia is a part of Syria.

It is clear from Isidore in his book on the divine Office that in Spain only the Latin version of Scripture was always read in public; similarly, in the council of Toledo IV, chapter 2, which was celebrated before the year 900, it was decreed that in all of Spain the same order should be observed in singing the Psalms, in Masses, in Readings, and in other ecclesiastical offices; and then in chapters 12,13,14 and 15 it is shown very clearly that then it was the custom that everything should be read in Latin, and this procedure has been preserved down to the present time.

There is no memory or trace of a change, but still now for many centuries in Spain Latin has ceased to be the common language. For, before the year 1100 it was separated from the Roman Empire, and subjected partly to the Goths and partly to the Moors, and they without doubt imposed a new language. For the Goths, whom some call Gethos, had their own language, according to Jerome at the beginning of his letter to Suniam and Fratellam. But St. Jerome says in the preface of book 2 on the letter to the Galatians that, even before the Goths corrupted the language of the Spaniards, there was in Spain their own local language; he also says that in the Balearic Islands there was then a vernacular language related to Greek.

In England Bede says in book 1, chapter one of his history of the English people that

during his time there were four vernacular languages in the different regions of the island. Nevertheless he says that Latin was proper to all because of the Scriptures, although some had their own maternal tongue.

It is known from Albino Alcuin, the teacher of Charlemagne, in his book on the Divine Office, that in Gaul [France] there was also the use of Latin in the public reading of the Scriptures, at a time when Latin was not the common language of the Gauls; we learn the same thing from Amalarius Trevirensis, who lived about the year 840, and wrote accurately about the Ecclesiastical Offices; there he also shows that not only in Gaul, but also in the rest of the West the divine Office was celebrated in the same way. However, that in Gaul at the time Latin was not the mother tongue is proved from the fact that, 200 years before the age of Amalarius, the Franks had occupied Gaul. Coming out of Franconia in the region of Germany, they settled in Gaul with a large number of people. Further, Jerome writes in his life of Hilary that the Franks had their own proper language. There, while speaking about someone obsessed by a devil, he said: *You would see that from a barbarian mouth, and from one who knew only the Frankish and Latin languages, pure Aramaic words sounded forth.* Indeed, even before the Franks occupied Gaul, that the language of the Gauls was different from Latin was mentioned by St. Jerome in the preface to book 2 of his commentary on the letter to the Galatians.

It is clearly stated by Rabanus, Bishop of Mainz who lived before the year 700, that in Germany at that time in the public reading of Scripture only Latin was used. For, in book 2 of the institutes for the clergy, when he is explaining the order of the divine services that were then observed in Germany, he clearly says the custom was that in public the divine Scriptures were read only in Latin; and he says that this was so not only in Germany, but that the same rule was followed in the rest of the West. He refers to the same thing in chapter 9 when he says this: *This is the Catholic order of the divine celebrations, which is observed by the whole Church with no variations, etc.*

The same rule can be gathered from Rupert Tuitiensis, who lived in Germany before the year 400, and in book 1 on the divine Offices clearly shows that in Germany, as in the rest of the Church, the divine Scriptures in Church are wont to be read only in Latin. But it is certain that Latin never was the vernacular language for the Germans; we know this both from Jerome in his letter to Suniam and Fratellam and in his life of Hilary, and also because German does not have any affiliation with Latin, so that it could be said to have evolved gradually from the corruption of the Latin language, as Italian, Spanish and French did.

In Bohemia and the neighboring regions, where Latin also was never the common language before the year 500, the divine Scriptures were read in Church in Latin. For, there exists a letter of Gregory VII in book 7 of his own letters, which was sent to the leader of the Bohemians, in which he says that he, for good reasons, does not want to permit them to celebrate the divine offices in the Slavonic language, as they had requested.

Finally, in Italy without any opposition the divine Scriptures have always been read in Church in Latin. For the Roman order of the divine offices is the same now substantially as it was from the beginning of the Church. Thus, Isidore in book 1, chapter 15 on the ecclesiastical offices says that the order used by the Roman Church was started

by St. Peter; but later Gelasius I improved this order and put it in a better form, as is clear from Decree 15 of the canon, *Sancta Romana.* And it was revised again by Gregory I, as we know from the book published by him on the sacraments. Then also Gregory VII, when he restored the order to its original form after it had been somewhat distorted with the passage of time, as is clear from the canon *In die,* distinction 5, and Pope Pius V did the same thing in our time.

Therefore, from an examination of these documents we understand that the Roman Church during this time celebrated the divine offices not only in the same language, but also in the same order and in the number of the readings and Psalms as she celebrated them over a thousand years ago at the time of Gelasius.

There ought to be no doubt that the use of Latin in Italy among the people ceased a long time ago, since Radevicus, who lived about the year 1170, in book 2, chapter 70 on the history of Frederick, writes that at the election of Pope Victor the people acclaimed him with these words: *Papa Vittore Santo Pietro Telegge.* Also St. Thomas, who lived 300 year ago, in his Commentary on 1 Cor. 14, says that during his time there was one language in Italy which the people used, and another in which the Scriptures were read in Church. Therefore we have in the whole Church of Christ that it was always observed that the sacred Scriptures were read in public only in Greek and Latin, even though they were not the vernacular and mother tongues. Given this argument, certainly I do not see that we need anything more convincing in order to rebuke the audacity of the contemporary Reformers.

But we can also use a fourth argument from reason. For, it helps very much to preserve the unity of the Church, that the public use of the Scriptures is in one common language: for, if the public use of the Scriptures is not in one common language, then the communication between the Churches is removed. For, no one, either learned or unlearned, will go to church except in his own country; and also there cannot be any general Councils, and not all the Fathers, who come to the Council, have the gift of languages, and this is the a priori reason why the Apostles wrote almost everything in Greek, because then the Greek language was the most common of all, as Cicero says in his Defense of Archias the Poet: *Greek,* he said, *is read in almost all the nations, while Latin is limited to rather small boundaries.*

But then the Scriptures were translated into Latin, because gradually with the increase of the Roman Empire, the Greek language ceased to be common in the West, and Latin became the common language, at least among the learned in Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, and other regions. Therefore since even now there is no common language in the whole West except Latin, certainly the divine Scriptures should be read in it.

Fifthly, if there were any reason why the Scriptures should be read in the vernacular language in gatherings of the faithful, this certainly would be the strongest—so that all might understand them. But certainly the people would not understand the Prophets, and the Psalms, and other things that are read in the Churches, even if they were read in the mother tongue. For, those of us who know Latin, do not because of that immediately understand the Scriptures, unless we read or listen to an explanation. Therefore, how will the unskilled understand them? There is also the fact that the Scriptures become more

obscure when they are translated into foreign languages.

And what if the people not only do not derive any fruit from the Scriptures, but also suffer some damage? For they would easily fall into the danger of erring both in the doctrine of the faith and in the precepts of life and morals; for, all heresies have taken their beginning from a false understanding of the Scriptures, as Hilary shows in comments on the synod which even Luther acknowledged, who called the Scriptures the book of heretics; and the same point is proved from experience.

Now Cassiodorus in his Collationes [10, chapters 2, 3,4 and 5] mentions the absurd errors of anthropomorphisms that are the result of ignorance, and Aeneas Sylvius, in his book on the origin of the Boeotians, speaks about the crass errors of the Thaboritarians, Orbitarians, and of others, who read the Scriptures in their mother tongue and did not understand them. This same thing happened to David Georgius, the worst of all the heretics, who knew no language except his own native tongue, that is, Batavian; but he deduced from the Scriptures that he was the Son of God and the Messiah, which is known from the book or letter, which the Basilians published about his errors.

Furthermore, if simple people should hear read in their own common language these words from the Canticle of Canticles: *O that you would kiss me with the kisses of your mouth!... O that his left hand were under my head, and that his right hand embraced me.* Then there is this in Hosea: *Go and have children of fornication.* Also there is David's adultery, the incest of Thamar, the lies of Judith, and how Joseph made his brothers drunk; Sarah, Lia and Rachel gave their young maids to their husbands as concubines, and there are many other things like this, which are mentioned with great praise. Either they would be induced to imitate these things, or they would despise the holy Patriarchs, as formerly the Manicheans did, or they would think that the Scriptures approve of lying. And since they would see so many apparent contradictions in the Scriptures, and would not be able to resolve them, there would be the danger that they would believe nothing.

I heard from a trustworthy man that, when he was in England, Ecclesiasticus 25 was read in church by a Calvinist Minister in the local language, and there many things are said about the evils of women; so a certain woman stood up and said: *Is that the word of God? Really it is the word of the Devil.*

Sixthly, if it were necessary publicly to read the sacred Scriptures in the vernacular language, it would also be necessary to change the translations with the passage of time. For, the vernacular languages change to a great extent from century to centuiy, as Horace says in the art of poetry and as we know from experience. But so many changes in translations take place not without serious danger and inconvenience. For, suitable translators are not always to be found; and so many errors are committed, which later cannot easily be remedied, since neither the Pontiffs nor the Councils can pass judgment on so many languages.

Seventhly, the majesty of the divine offices absolutely seems to require a more grave and venerable language than the ones we use in daily life, if it can be done appropriately. This is so especially since there are many things in the sacred mysteries which ought to be kept secret, as the ancient authors also teach, namely, Dionysius in chapter 1 on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, Origen in homily 5 on Numbers, Basil in chapter 27 on the

Holy Spirit, Chrysostom in homily 24 on Matthew, and Gregory in book 4, chapter 56 of his Dialogues. And on this matter the response of Kemnitius is not appropriate, since he tries to show that in no way is the Latin language more holy, more venerable than the other languages. For we do not say that it is more holy or also more grave, if we look at the words, but we say that it is more grave and venerable because it is not a vernacular language.

The testimonies of the grave, holy Fathers can be added to what we just said, namely, that of the Greek Basil and of the Latin Jerome, who indeed did not think that it was necessary that all men should treat the Scriptures without any choice, even if at the time it could not easily be impeded, since Greek and Latin were still the common languages for some peoples. Theodoret in book 4, chapter 17 of his History reports that, when the Prefect of the kitchen of the emperor said something about the Scriptures, he heard him being rebuked by the great Basil: *Your job is to think about the food, not to cook up divine dogmas.* Now, I ask, what would Basil say if he saw druggists, tailors and other workmen giving sermons from the pulpits among the Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptists? Jerome in his letter to Paulinus on the Study of Scripture said: *Doctors talk about medicines, workmen talk about their tools. It is only the art of the Scripture, which everyone claims for himself. The learned and the ignorant write poems about it, a garrulous old woman speaks about it, a crazy old man says this, a verbose sophist writes something else, and all presume and mangle it before they have learned anything about it.*

This complaint of Jerome is now very common in all of Germany and France. For, all workers, not only men but also women have the Scriptures in their hands, and from their reading they add to their ignorance indocility and arrogance. For, because they can quote the words of the Apostle and cite the books and chapters, they think that they know everything, and in no way do they permit themselves to be taught. For example, see John Cochlaeus in the 1522 book on the life and deeds of Luther.

CHAPTER XVI

THE OBJECTIONS OF THE HERETICS ARE ANSWERED

Now let us see what objections they raise. In the first place, they quote the words form 1 Cor. 14 where the Apostle teaches that the public readings and prayers of the Church should be done in the vernacular language, for he says this: *And if the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for battle? So with yourselves; if you in a tongue utter speech that is not intelligible, how will anyone know what is said? For you will be speaking into the air.* And further on he says: *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful. What am I to do? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the mind also; I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the mind also. Otherwise, if you bless with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the "Amen" to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying? For you may give thanks well enough, but the other man is not edified.*

I respond, first of all, that it is certain that in a large part of this chapter Paul is not dealing with the reading of Scripture, nor with the divine services, but with spiritual exhortation and conversation. For, as formerly the monks gathered together and spoke about spiritual things, and from that came the collations of the Fathers as found in Cassian, so also in the early Church, as St. Justin says at the end of his Second Apology, the Christians assembled on Sundays. First, the Scriptures were read, next there was a sermon by the Préside r, and then the mysteries were celebrated; finally, they discussed divine things among themselves.

Therefore lest the multitude fall into confusion, the Apostle directed that only two or three persons should speak in each common gathering, and the others should listen and weigh what is said; and if perhaps, while one is speaking, someone else is inspired to say something better, that the first one should be silent and the second should speak. And because among the Corinthians at times there were some who, in order to manifest the gift of tongues, spoke in a foreign tongue, the Apostle corrects them; for, the exhortations should be understood by all.

It can be understood that this is the true explanation of the major part of this chapter both from the fact that the older Fathers interpreted this passage in this way, namely, Cyprian in his letter to Pompey and in his letter to Quirinius about the rebaptism of heretics (St. Augustine praises this explanation in book 2, chapter 8 in his treatise on Baptism against the Donatists), Basil, Ambrose, Sedulius, Haymo, Theodoretus and Oecumenius on this text; and also from the words of the Apostle. For that expression, *Let two or three prophets speak, and let the others weigh what is said;* and this one: *If a revelation is made to another sitting by, let the first be silent;* and then this one: *the women should keep silence in the churches,* and many similar directions can be applied only to exhortation. For the reading of the Scriptures and the divine services should not be judged by the Prophets. And they are not inspired when they read, since they are only proclaiming what was formerly inspired; and the women in Church never celebrated the divine mysteries. Therefore the words raised in objection against us are understood to be

dealing with an exhortation: *If the bugle gives an indistinct sound, who will get ready for battle? So with yourselves; if you in a tongue utter speech that is not intelligible, how will anyone know what is said? For you will be speaking into the air.*

But there still remains a difficulty with these words: *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful. What am I to do? I will pray with the spirit and I will pray with the mind also; I will sing with the spirit and I will sing with the mind also. Otherwise, if you bless with the spirit, how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the "Amen" to your thanksgiving when he does not know what you are saying?* For in these words it seems that he is dealing not with exhortation, but with prayers and Psalms. On this point, it has been noted in passing that Ambrose and Haymo read this passage with two questions: *Who takes the place of the outsider? How will he respond "Amen"?* However, the Greeks have always read it as our Vulgate readings gives it, *How can anyone in the position of an outsider say the "Amen," when he does not know what you are saying?* Calvin, Beza and our other adversaries approve this reading as the better one.

Therefore, in order to resolve this difficulty, some say this: even in these words he is dealing with an exhortation, and not with prayers. Thus Basil, Theodoretus, and Sedulius, who were just mentioned above. But it seems difficult to defend this; for προσεύξομαι and ψαλώ and ἐυχαριστεῖς, the words that the Apostle uses, do not mean to stir up, but *to pray* and *to sing* and *to give thanks.* Therefore Chrysostom and Theophylact, and also Ambrose and Haymo understand this passage to be about prayers.

Therefore others say that the Apostles is indeed speaking about the divine services, but he does not require that all the people understand, but only that someone understands, who can respond in the name of the people, and he signifies this with the words: *how can anyone in the position of an outsider say the "Amen"?* This passage was understood in this way by Haymo, Primasius, Peter Lombard, St. Thomas, and other Latin authors. But this solution does not seem to be totally satisfactory: for, the words of the Apostle, ὁ ἀναπληρών τον τόπον του ιδιώτου does not mean according to the use of the Greek language, *who acts in the place of the outsider,* but, *who fulfills the role of the outsider,* that is, *who sits in the place of outsiders, who occupies the place of the outsiders, who is from the outsiders and is an outsider,* as Chrysostom and Theophylact explain this text. For, not only profane authors, but also Christians do not use the word τόπος for *in place of,* but the adverb άντί. This is evident from 1 Macc. 9:31 *he took the place of Judas,* and in chapter 11:9 *to rule in the place of his father,* and in chapter 13:14 *in the place of his brother Jonathan,* and in chapter 14:17 *the high priest in his place,* for the right word is always άνά.

There is also another opinion, namely, that the Apostle, when he says, *who acts in the place of the outsider,* is thinking about the one who is an outsider; but he does not call him an outsider who really is an outsider, but one whose role it is to be an outsider, that is, who responds for the outsiders. Just as sometimes we say that a man is popular, who, although he is a patriot, nevertheless embraces a faction of the people; thus this opinion will be the same as the one above, but it is explained a little bit differently. Thus Sixtus wanted to solve this problem in book 6, note 263 in his holy Library, where he says that the words of Chrysostom in homily 35 on 1 Cor. have not been translated correctly. For,

the words of Chrysostom are, ιδιώτην δε λαϊκόν λέγει. But the translator renders it as, *but he calls the outsider the common people,* when he should have rendered it as, *he calls the outsider a layman,* that is, a man designated in the Church for the laity.

But this explanation does not seem to agree completely with this passage, since the objection can be made: at the time of the Apostles all the people were wont to respond in the divine services, and no one was designated to respond for the people. For, Justin towards the end of his second Apology for Christians says in very clear words that all the people in the Church were accustomed to respond "Amen," when the priest concluded a prayer or an act of thanksgiving.

Moreover, it is clear from the liturgy of Chrysostom that for a long time afterwards this custom was observed both in the East and in the West; he says this at the end of his works, where a clear distinction is made concerning what is sung in the divine services by the priest, by the Deacons, and by the people. The same idea is found in Cyprian's sermon on the Lord's Prayer, where he says that the people respond, *Habemus ad Dominum,* and in Jerome's preface to the letter to the Galatians, where he says that in the churches in Rome the sound of the people's response of "Amen" was like a heavenly thunder.

Therefore the true meaning here is that the Apostle is not talking about the divine services, or about the public reading of the Scriptures, but about spiritual songs, which the Christians composed in order to praise God, and to give thanks, and this was at the same time for their consolation and edification. That the Apostle is not speaking about the Scriptures or the divine services is proved from the fact that the Scriptures without doubt were read in Greek, and the divine services were celebrated in Greek in Greece, as even the heretics admit. But the Apostle here is speaking about the prayer and thanksgiving, which took place through the gift of tongues, that is, especially in a foreign tongue, which no one understood, like Arabic or Persian, as Chrysostom and all the others explain it. In fact, it took place often in a language which the one speaking it did not understand, as these words indicate: *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful,* that is, if I pray with the gift of tongues, a tongue that I do not understand, *my spirit prays,* that is, *my affection prays,* but *my mind is unfruitful,* that is, *my mind is not instructed,* because I do not know what I am saying. Similarly, there is the other sentence: *One who speaks in a tongue speaks not to men but to God, for no one understands him,* that is, *no one pays attention, because no one understands him.* Therefore, he is not talking about the divine services, which since they were held in Greek, were understood by many, but he is talking about the prayer, or the praise of God, or the thanksgiving, which some at times sung in the assemblies in a foreign language.

Furthermore, it is certain that Christian were accustomed to compose and sing spiritual songs in Church for the time of the spiritual collations. For, Eusebius says this in book 2, chapter 17 of his history; likewise Dionysius in chapters 3 and 4 on the Divine Names, where he recounts many things from the songs of Hierotheus. Tertullian also in his Apologetics [ch. 39] when describing the Christian Agape, that is, the public dinner, which was held in the Church, says that it was customary for those who could do it, to sing something to God of their own composition. Finally, the Apostle himself in Eph. 5:18 and Col. 3:16 says that they should encourage each other with Psalms, hymns and spiritual

songs. Haymo thinks that here he is referring to songs that they themselves composed. Therefore, since those songs were for the consolation of the people, the Apostle wants them to be done in a language that was understood, so that the outsiders, who do not know how to compose similar songs, at least could endorse them by saying "Amen."

But you will object. Just as the Apostle desired those songs to be in the vernacular language, so that the people could answer "Amen," so also he had to wish that the divine services be celebrated in the vernacular so that the people could answer "Amen." I respond by denying the consequence, because the divine services were held in Greek, which many of the people understood, although not all, and this was enough. For, the Apostle did not want that all could respond. Moreover, since then the Christians were few in number. All together sang in the Church, and responded in the divine services. But afterwards, with the increase in numbers, the services became more separated, and it was left to the Clerics alone to perform the prayers and the praises in Church. Finally, the main purpose of those songs was the instruction and consolation of the people, for that was done in the collations in place of the exhortation. And so it was helpful that they were understood by many, and unless the language was known, or a translation was given immediately, their special fruit would have been lost. But the main purpose of the divine services is not instruction or the consolation of the people, but the worship of God, and what the people ought to know is explained by the pastors outside the divine services.

The second objection. No help flows from a prayer that is not understood (Isa. 29:13; Matt. 15:8): *This people honors me with their lips, etc.* And 1 Cor. 14:14: *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful, etc.* Therefore all prayers, both public and private, should be in the vernacular language. This objection comes from Calvin. But the answer to it is easy. For, first of all it is false that no fruit is perceived by the people from the public prayer of the Church, unless the prayer is understood by the people. For, the prayer of the Church is not directed to the people, but to God for the people. Therefore it is not necessary that the people understand it, so that they benefit from it, but it is sufficient if God understands. Just as if someone in the presence of the King should pray in Latin for a peasant, certainly the peasant would be able to perceive some benefit from it, even if he does not understand the prayer of his advocate.

Furthermore, the Church prays for the faithful and other sinners, who often not only do not understand, but do not even hear, and do not want to be prayed for; and nevertheless the Church does not pray in vain. How much more is it not in vain that she prays for the faithful who are present and desire prayers for their own needs? Hence in Lev. 16:17f. God commanded that, when the priest entered the Sanctuary to pray for himself and for the people, the people were to remain outside, so that not only did they not understand, but they did not hear or see the priest. We read that this was done also at the time of Zechariah in Luke 1 and who can doubt that his prayer was a benefit for the people? Hence also Origen said in homily 20 on Joshua: *If you see sometimes that the Scripture is read in your hearing and you do not understand it, still you know that you have received this first help, which by hearing alone drives away the troubles that beset you.* And Chrysostom said in his homily 3 on Lazarus: *What are we to think, if we do not understand what is contained in the sacred books? Very much indeed, and even if you do*

not understand the profound things contained in them, nevertheless much sanctity is the result of such reading.

And not only can the people derive fruit from the prayer of others, even though they do not understand it, but also from that which they pour forth to God for themselves; for, as St. Augustine teaches in book 3, chapter 9 of his Christian Doctrine, the Jews did not worship God in vain with their various offerings and ceremonies, many of which they understood less than our peasants understand the Latin words.

In addition, the same Augustine in book 6, chapter 25 in his treatise on Baptism said: *Many people make use of prayers composed not only by ignorant babblers but also by heretics, and through the simplicity of their ignorance not being able to discern their true nature, they use them, thinking that they are good, but not that what is perverse in them negates what is right in them, but rather is made void by them.* With these words St. Augustine is teaching that also a prayer, in which something heretical is included, is not without fruit, when it is said by someone who does not know what it says, and thinks that he is praying well. For, as Augustine says in the same place, often the devotion of the one praying overcomes the error of the prayer. For, God does not so much look at what we say, as he does to what we want to say; therefore if not-understood and bad prayers are not fruitless when they are said in good faith, how much more excellent are the prayers composed by the Church, even if they are not understood?

Hence Origen in homily 20 on Joshua said: *Although we do not understand what we say with our mouth, nevertheless the virtues which are near to us understand, and being invited as it were by a song, they are present to us and are happy to bring us help, etc.* He then illustrates this matter with two similitudes: *For if it was believed by the Gentiles that certain songs, which they call chants, and which is a special art, when whispered have a certain force, which not even those who invoke them are aware of, and from the mere sound of the voice, either serpents are put to sleep or when hidden in caves are drawn out; how much more strong and powerful do we believe that the words of Sacred Scripture are when they are sung and chanted?* And further on he says: *Doctors now and then are wont to prepare some food, sometimes also to give some drink, and nevertheless in eating that food and taking the drink we do not know what good it will do. Therefore in this way,* he said, *one must also believe in sacred Scripture, because it is helpful and benefits the soul, even if our mind at the time does not fully understand it.* That is what he has to say.

Furthermore, if it were necessary to understand whatever we say while praying or praising God, then only some or no one would be able to sing the Psalms of David, and to read the Prophets and the Apostles in the divine services. For, how many persons are there who understand all the sentences of the Psalms, the Prophets and the Apostles? When we sing, how many things occur that we do not understand? But still we should not run away from the Church in order to consult a Commentary, and still we do not sing in vain, provided that we sing with reverence and devotion; for we know that whatever it is, it contributes to the praise of God. What should we think about what St. Anthony was wont to say, namely, that that prayer is perfect, in which the soul is so absorbed in God that it does not understand its own words?

These Scriptures are not opposed to this: *This people honors me with their lips;* and, *If I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is unfruitful, etc.* For, in the first quote he is not dealing with prayer or reading, but with those who profess piety with their lips and say that they love God, however in their deeds they do the opposite, as Jerome explains in comments on Isa. 29, and Augustine in book 22, chapter 55 against Faustus. But if someone wishes to refer those words to prayer, he should say that those are rebuked who, although they know the language in which they pray, do not pay attention to what they are saying, but wander mentally to other affairs.

In the second Scripture just quoted the prayer is not rebuked that is not understood, but the prayer that is understood is preferred to it. For the Apostle does not say that the prayer is unfruitful, but the mind. For, those who pray in a language they do not know, as when illiterate persons recite in Latin the seven Psalms, they benefit from it emotionally and spiritually, but their mind is unfruitful because it is not instructed. But the Apostle declares in these words that such prayer is not reprehended as bad or totally unfruitful: *For you may give thanks well enough.* And Chrysostom clearly says the same thing in comments on this verse. You can add to this what was shown above, namely, that the Apostle is speaking about a language which no one in the whole Church can understand. Therefore in vain are these apostolic words put forth as being opposed to the custom of the Church. For although in the common Latin prayers of the Church the mind of the uninstructed remains without fruit, nevertheless their affections do not remain without fruit, nor does the mind of many others who know Latin; and the fruit of the mind which is lacking in the uninstructed is compensated for by the many advantages that flow from it, because the Scriptures in the public meetings are assiduously read in the common idiom, that is, in Latin.

The third objection is that of Brentius in the Decretals. He says that in several decrees of the judicial order Innocent III prescribed that, when in a city men are mixed together who speak different languages, the Bishop should provide suitable men, who can celebrate the divine services in different languages, and administer the Sacraments to the people speaking different languages.

I respond that Innocent is speaking in that decree only about Greek and Latin. For, during the time of Innocent, Constantinople was captured by the Latins, and since the Emperor and the Patriarch of Constantinople were Latins, in Greece there were many Latins mixed together with the Greeks. In the general Lateran Council the Pontiff had been petitioned, in a request with which both Greeks and Latins agreed, to allow two Bishops to be ordained in such places. However, the Pontiff responded that he did not agree that there should be two Bishops in one Church, but he did say that the Bishop should provide that there be available suitable ministers, who could celebrate the holy services in Greek for the Greeks, and in Latin for the Latins. And this decree is chapter 9 of the Council and from there it gets its name.

Therefore, that the decree is not speaking about vernacular languages is clear both from the history just mentioned, and also because the decree was observed especially in Italy, where the Sovereign Pontiff resides, and where he has the temporal rule. But in the rest of Italy that was never observed, for St. Thomas, who lived a short time after the

decree was made, composed the Office in Latin for the feast of Corpus Christi, which we still use today; however, he does say in his commentary on 1 Cor. 14 that the common language of Italians at the time he was writing was not Latin.

The fourth objection also comes from Brentius. The purpose of the divine services and of public readings is the instruction, consolation and edification of the people. For, in Rom 15:4 it says: *that by steadfastness and encouragement of the scriptures we might have hope.* And in 1 Cor. 14:19: *I would rather speak five words with my mind, in order to instruct others, than ten thousand words in a tongue.* And later in the same place (14:26): *when you come together, each one has a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. Let all things be done for edification.* But from a foreign and unknown language, what lesson, what edification, what encouragement can be perceived?

I respond that both the proposition and the assumption of this argument are false. For, the main purpose of the divine services is not the instruction of the people, or encouragement, but the worship due to God from the Church. For, the duty of the clergy is in the name of the whole Christian people constantly to offer a sacrifice of praise to God, as he requires in Ps. 41 and like soldiers to stand guard, and to protect the whole body of the Church with vigils and prayers. Thus in Isa. 62:6: *Upon your walls, O Jerusalem, I have set my watchmen, all the day and all the night they shall never be silent.* Then, those who are not uninstructed, they know Latin and are instructed, when they hear the divine services; but the others would not be instructed, even if the liturgy were celebrated in the vernacular; for, the instruction is not in the words, but in the meaning. Therefore the sermons, which ought to be given often in the individual Churches, provide instruction for the people.

And those three quotes from Scripture are not in any way opposed to our opinion. For we maintain that the sacred Scriptures provide great encouragement for the Faithful, as the Apostle says in Rom. 15:4; it does it for the learned when they are read, but for the unlearned when they are explained by the preachers. And rightly St. Paul prefers to speak five words with meaning for instruction, than ten thousand words in a tongue, for an exhortation is better that is understood by all, although it may be brief, than one which is not understood, even though it is long. Finally, through those five words—a psalm, teaching, revelation, a tongue and interpretation—the divine Scriptures are not understood, but they are five gifts freely given. For, a short time before in the same chapter the Apostle speaks about these gifts in this way: *If I come to you speaking in tongues, how shall I benefit you unless I bring you some revelation or knowledge or prophecy or teaching?*

Therefore by a tongue he means the gift of tongues; by teaching he understands the gift of teaching, which pertains to good morals, or also to the Faith; by revelation he means the gift of revelation, for then God often revealed mysteries to those sitting in church; by interpretation he understands the gift of explaining Scripture, and of translating it from one language to another—Paul often says that this gift is also prophecy; by a psalm he understands the freely given gift of singing, as Chrysostom rightly explains it, namely, the gift of composing spiritual songs and of singing them modestly in church. Therefore his meaning is this: when in you meetings and collations you can exercise all these gifts

of tongues, revelation, etc., see to it that nothing is done for the sake of ostentation, but all should be done for utility and edification.

The fifth objection is that of Kemnitius. Jesus preached in the vernacular language; on the day of Pentecost the Apostles spoke in various languages about the glory of God, and afterwards, dispersed throughout the world, they preached everywhere in the languages of the people they were trying to convert. Therefore, it is necessaiy to have the sacred Scriptures in various languages, and they should be the vernacular ones. For, if the word of God is not defiled if it is proclaimed in a vernacular language, why is it defiled if it is written in a vernacular language?

I respond that nothing is concluded with this argument. For, if the result is good for Scripture from the preaching, why did the Apostles write only in Greek, since they preached in so many languages? Therefore the word of God is rightly preached in the common language, because the preaching contains an explanation, which all can easily understand; but when it is written, it is written in the original form and it is not understood by all. Therefore, just as it is not licit to argue like this: Mothers give their infants bread broken into small pieces and also pre-chewed; therefore they can also give them regular baked bread, since it is the same bread. Likewise it is not licit to argue: the word of God is administered to the people and explained by the preacher; therefore it should be administered without an explanation and written in the vernacular language.

The sixth objection comes from the same Kemnitius. St. Jerome says that he translated the Scriptures into the Slavic language. Similarly, the Scriptures long ago were translated into the Chaldean language, which then was the common language, and later into Greek, which then was the vernacular, and the Apostles used that translation. Later, they were also translated into Latin, when it was the common language, and Christ on the cross cited Scripture in Aramaic, that is, the vernacular language; therefore there is no danger in translating them into the vernacular languages.

I respond: first of all, we do not deny that the Scriptures can be translated into the vernacular languages, but what we are contending is that they should not be read publicly in the vernacular, nor should there be in general permission for all to read the Scriptures in the vernacular language. But I do not know for certain whether Jerome translated the divine Letters into the Slavonic language. For, I have not read that anywhere in the works of Jerome or in any of the other Fathers; nevertheless, if he did it, he did not do it so that the Scriptures could be read publicly in Slavonic, but for the encouragement of those men, who could use them without danger, as also among us at the present time this permission is granted to certain individuals. Further, the Chaldean edition is not actually a translation, but it is a paraphrase and it never had significant authority among Catholics.

But what is said about the Greek translation actually works for us, for the Scriptures were not translated into Greek because it was the vernacular, but because it was universal language at that time. For certainly for Ptolemy the King of Egypt, who saw to it that the translation was made, the Greek language was not the vernacular. I can say the same thing about Latin, namely, that the Scriptures were translated into Latin, because it was the common language in the whole West, although for a few people it was still the vernacular.

Next concerning the words of Christ. Although Epiphanius in Heresies 69, which concerns the Arians, thinks that Christ on the cross uttered that quote partly in Hebrew and partly in Aramaic, *My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me;* nevertheless it is more probable that the whole sentence was spoken by Christ in Hebrew, as it is in Psalm 22. For, there is no reason why the Lord should begin the words of David in Hebrew, and then change to Aramaic. Therefore, St. Jerome in his book on Hebrew words, when treating this text, does not say the words are Aramaic, but he says that the words are in Hebrew, 'aratv 'bit and in Latin letters he wrote it like this: *Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani,* and it is certain that this is Hebrew.

Erasmus also, to whom Kemnitius is much indebted, in his commentary on this passage says: Christ spoke those words in pure Hebrew. Add to this that in Aramaic he would have said, *Hil, HU, lemana sehactani,* but that in Greek and Latin we have *sebactani,* not *sabachthani,* as it should be. This was done so that it could be pronounced more easily, just as we are wont to say Isaiah, Ezekiel, Jerome, Assuerus, and other words of this kind, instead of *Jesajahu, Irmejahu, Chizkiahu, Achasueros,* and for other very difficult Hebrew words.

The seventh objection comes also from Kemnitius. Chrysostom often exhorts the laity to read the Scriptures. Therefore it is right to allow all to read the Scriptures in the vernacular. And although Kemnitius does not mention a place for this in Chrysostom, we can cite one of his texts. Thus he says in homily 9 on the letter to the Colossians: *Listen, I beseech all of you people, get your own copy of the Bible; it is medicine for the soul. If you cannot get all of it, get at least the New Testament, the Acts of the Apostles, the Gospels, etc.* He says something similar in homily 2 on Matthew, in the preface to the letters of St. Paul, in homily 3 on 2 Thess., in homily 10 on John, and in homily 3 on Lazarus.

I respond that the words of Chrysostom, which he spoke in sermons, should always be taken according to his mind and to the occasions in which he was motivated to say them. Therefore, since at that time men were addicted to theatres, spectacles, and other diversions, and they never read the divine Scriptures, not even those who had the ability to do so, therefore in order to attack this idleness, Chrysostom constantly urged all to read the Scriptures, not that he wanted absolutely all, even the uneducated, to do it, but that at least those should do it, who could do it in a fruitful way. For he knew that he was dealing with those who needed this help. That this was the case can be demonstrated from many of his writings; but for now I will be contented to cite three of them.

Therefore in homily 4 on Lazarus he says this: *It is not possible for anyone to obtain salvation, unless he is engaged constantly in spiritual reading.* But if this is taken literally, who cannot see that it is false? What then? If someone did not learn how to read, does that mean he cannot be saved? Therefore the statement is hyperbole, and is not meant literally. In homily 15 on Genesis he said: *It is not allowed to swear either in a just cause on in an unjust cause.* And in homily 17 on Matthew he said: *What should one do then, if someone demands an oath, and he imposes the necessity of swearing? The fear of God should be for you stronger than any such necessity.* Therefore he seems to desire that one should in no way swear, even though it is certain that it is a religious act and

something good to swear concerning a matter that is just and necessary. But Chrysostom used amplifications of this kind in his sermons, because his people were addicted in a strange way to oaths, as we learn from his homily 9 on the Acts of the Apostles, and from other writings of the same author.

There is one final objection. It was granted by the Apostolic See before the year 600 to celebrate the divine services in the Slavonic language, and also even now the Ruthenians, Armenians, Egyptians, Ethiopians, and I do not know how many other peoples, celebrate the liturgy in their own vernacular languages.

I respond that we are not moved more by the examples of the Ruthenians, Armenians and others, than we are moved by the examples of the Lutherans, Anabaptists and Calvinists, who read the Scriptures publicly in German, or French, or English, or Polish, or in other vernacular languages. For they are either heretics or schismatics, and we know that most Catholic have done otherwise, as we have demonstrated above. But if there are some Catholics among them, as the Maronites really are in Syria, and others both among the Armenians and the Ruthenians, they do not celebrate the divine services in Hebrew, Greek or Latin, because those languages are wont to be in use among the learned in those regions; however they do celebrate with a language that is not the vernacular one. For the Maronites for their common language use Arabic, but in the divine services they use Chaldean, and those who, in the divine services, use Syrian or Arabic, use a classic type of language, not the popular brand; the Greeks also do this, since in daily life they use a vernacular form of Greek; but for the divine services they use classical Greek.

With regard to the Moravians I respond that there was a just reason why that had to be allowed at that time, because in fact (as Aeneas Sylvius recounts in his book on the origin of the Bohemians [chapter 13]) the whole kingdom was converted at the same time, and ministers could not be found who could celebrate in Latin. So it seemed better to the Sovereign Pontiff to permit that it be done in Slavonic, rather than not at all. Afterwards, however, when there was an increase in erudition, and suitable ministers were found who could present the same services in Latin, it was found to be better to omit the use of the Slavonic language, and to follow the common practice of the whole Church, and now that is what the Moravian Catholics do. Now that is enough about the versions of the Scriptures.

BOOK THREE

On the interpretation and true meaning of Scripture

CHAPTER I

SCRIPTURE IS NOT SO CLEAR BY ITSELF THAT, WITHOUT SOME EXPLANATION, IT SUFFICES TO END CONTROVERSIES ABOUT THE FAITH

For the Scriptures in this third book on the interpretation of the divine letters I decided to begin with this question: Are the divine Scriptures by themselves easily and clearly understood, or do they need some interpretation? Indeed, Martin Luther says in the preface to the letter condemned by Pope Leo: *It is necessary, according to the judgment of Scripture, to draw this conclusion—that it cannot happen, unless we give to Scripture the first place in all things which often is given to the Fathers, that is, that Scripture by itself is most certain, easy, open for the interpretation of itself, proving, judging and illuminating all things, etc.* In the same place he contends that Scripture is clearer than the Commentaries of all the Fathers. He teaches similar things in his book on free will and elsewhere.

But since Luther saw that one could immediately raise the objection: Why are there so many controversies, if Scripture is so clear? He invented two escapes from this. One, that Scripture, although it is obscure in some places, still those points are clarified elsewhere. The second, that Scripture, although by itself is very clear, still for proud persons and infidels it is obscure because of their blindness and hardness of heart.

Brentius in his Prologue against Peter a Soto adds a third escape, namely, that sometimes it is obscure because of phrases in a foreign language, that is, Hebrew and Greek, but its meaning is clear. This opinion is manifestly false, for Scripture itself bears witness to its own obscurity and difficulty in Ps. 119: *Give me understanding, that I may keep thy law* (v. 34). In the same place: *Open my eyes, that I may behold the wondrous things out of thy law* (v. 18). And in the same place: *Make thy face shine upon thy servant, and teach me thy statutes* (v. 135). And certainly David knew all the Scripture, which existed at the time, and he knew the expressions of the Hebrew language, nor was he proud or unbelieving. Therefore rightly St. Jerome in his letter to Paulinus, while treating these words, says this: *If such a great prophet professes the darkness of ignorance, do you not realize that we little ones, who have just been weaned, are surrounded by a night of ignorance?*

Moreover, in Luke 24 the Lord interpreted the Scriptures for his disciples, who certainly knew the Hebrew expressions, since they were Hebrews, and they were not proud or unbelieving. In Acts 8:28 the Eunuch of the Queen of the Ethiopians was reading the Scriptures, and he was reading them diligently; he was also holy, pious and

humble, as Jerome says in his letter to Paulinus on the Study of Scripture, and still when he was asked by Philip: *Do you understand what you are reading? He answered: How can I, unless someone guides me?*

Finally, in 2 Pet. 3:15-16 Peter says that in the letters of Paul there are some things hard to understand, *which the ignorant and unstable twist to their own destruction.* There it should be noted that the Apostle Peter did not say that there are some things difficult for the unlearned and the unstable, as the heretics explain it, but difficult absolutely. For, St. Augustine, who certainly was not unlearned or unstable, in his book of Faith and Works, chapters 15 and 16, admits that it was very difficult for him to understand the text in 1 Cor. 3:12, *Now if anyone builds on the foundation, etc.,* and he says that this is one of the places concerning which St. Peter warned that it is difficult to understand.

Then besides the testimony of Scripture, the same point can be shown from the common consent of the ancient Fathers. Irenaeus in book 2, chapter 47, after he said that in created and natural things much is hidden from us, adds this: *Therefore if in created things, some of them are known by God, but others are known by us: what harm is there, if of those things that are contained in the Scriptures, since many spiritual things are present in all the Scriptures, we understand some of them according to the grace of God, but others we commend to God, and not only in this world but also in the future world, so that indeed God is always teaching, but man is always learning the things pertaining to God?*

Origen in book 7 against Celsus said: *Also some wise men, by searching the Scriptures, have been able to understand it, although really it is obscure in many places.* Also, in homily 5 on Leviticus he says something similar, citing the similitude of sacrificed victims, a part of which was eaten by the Priests, and a part was burned for God. Likewise in his homily 12 on Exodus he said: *It is necessary to pray day and night that the lamb of the tribe of Judah will come, and that he will deign to open the sealed book.* Ruffinus in book 2, chapter 9 of his History wrote the following about Basil and Gregory Nazianzen: *Both of noble birth, both educated in Athens, both colleagues, they set aside all their books written by the pagan Greeks and dedicated themselves to study only the books of the divine Scriptures. They sought to understand them not from their own self assurance, but from the writings and authority of their predecessors, when it was established that they had received the rule of understanding them from the apostolic succession.*

Now Chrysostom, whom the heretics often cite as opposed to us, had this to say in his tenth homily on John: *You search the Scriptures* (5:39). *Christ seriously recommended to the Jews that they embrace not a simple and plain reading of the Scriptures, but a careful investigation. For he did not say "Read the Scriptures," but "Search them." For divine things require the greatest diligence. For he spoke to most of them in an obscure way, and therefore he orders us to dig more deeply, so that we can find the lofty things that are hidden. For we do not dig for something on the surface and out in the open, but a treasure that is deeply hidden. Therefore the one who seeks something of this kind, unless he uses the greatest diligence and effort, will never find what he is seeking.* Likewise, the Author of the unfinished homily 44 on Matthew offers two reasons why the Scriptures are obscure. First, because God wants some to be teachers and other to be disciples.

Second, lest if it were totally clear, it would not be as useful as it would be contemptible.

Ambrose said in letter 44 to Constantius: *The divine Scripture is an ocean, having in itself a profound meaning, the depth of prophetic enigmas, etc,* Jerome in his letter to Paulinus on the Study of Scripture clearly teaches that the Scriptures cannot be learned without a teacher, and running briefly through the names of the individual books, he shows that there are many great difficulties in all of them. And in the preface of his Commentary on the letter to the Ephesians he said: *From my adolescence I did not cease either to read or to ask learned men about things I did not know, and I had only myself as a teacher. Finally, recently because of this very important reason, I traveled to Alexandria in order to consult with Didymus, and to seek from him in all the Scriptures answers to my doubts.* And in his letter to Algasias, in question 8, he said: *The entire letter to the Romans is wrapped up in too many obscurities.*

Augustine in book 2, chapter 6 of his Christian Doctrine said: *Those who read casually are deceived by very many obscurities and ambiguities—thinking one thing for something else; but in some places they do not find anything to interpret erroneously, so obscurely are certain sayings covered over with a most dense mist. I do not doubt that all of this has been provided by God to conquer pride by work and to combat disdain in our minds, to which those things that are easily discovered seem frequently to become worthless.* Similarly, in book 12, chapter 14 in his *Confessions* he said: *Marvelous is the profundity of your sayings. Their surface lies before us, flattering us as we flatta children. But wonderful is their profundity, O God, wonderful is their profundity. To gaz into it is a shuddering, the shudder of awe, the shudder of love.* And in letter 3 which i now 137: *So great is the profundity of the Christian writings, that I would make progress in them every day, if I tried to study only them from the beginning of my childhood until my decrepit old age constantly, with great effort and with all my ability.* And in letter IE which is now 55 he says in chapter 21 : *In the Holy Scriptures themselves there are many more things I do not know than I do know.*

Gregory in homily 6, book 1 on Ezekiel said: *The obscurity itself of the sayings of God is of great utility, because it exercises the mind, so that it is enlarged by fatigue, and with such exercise it grasps what it could not grasp in leisure. It has still something more because the understanding of sacred Scripture, if it were easy for all, would be worthless In certain more obscure places when the meaning is found it refreshes the mind with a greater sweetness, according as what is sought with great effort wearies the mind* Certainly those Fathers knew the expressions, and they were not proud or unfaithful, and still they frankly admit that the Scriptures are difficult. Accordingly, the temerity and vanity of Luther and Brentius, in my opinion, are sufficiently and clearly demonstrated.

In order to prove this point, besides the authorities, there is also the confirmation of reason. For, in the Scriptures two things can be considered—the things that are said, and the way in which they are said. If you consider the things, it is necessary to admit that the Scriptures are very obscure, since they speak about the greatest mysteries—the divine Trinity, the Incarnation of the Word, the heavenly Sacraments, the nature of the angels the operation of God on the minds of men, eternal predestination and reprobation, and all kinds of arcane and supernatural things, which are investigated not without a lot of study

and hard work, and not without the danger of falling into grave errors. Certainly, if the science of Metaphysics is more difficult and obscure than all other natural disciplines, because it considers the first causes, why will not sacred Scripture be obscure, which is treating things much more lofty? This is evident, because a great part of Scripture contains prophecies about future things, and prophecies written as songs, than which certainly nothing is more difficult, nothing more obscure.

Then if we consider the way of speaking, we will find innumerable causes of difficulty. First, in Scripture there are many things, which at first sight seem to be contradictory, as the following in Exod. 20:5, *I the Lord your God am a Jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation.* And then in Ezek. 18:20, *The son shall not suffer for the iniquity of the father, but the soul that sins shall die.* Second, there are ambiguous words and prayers, as in John 8:25 to the Jews who asked, *Who are you?* And Christ answered them: *the beginning (principium), who is also speaking to you.* In an amazing way all the commentators anguish over this text, and even now it is not known what this means: *the beginning, who:* and in the Greek it is even more obscure where the word *Beginning* is in the accusative case, τήν αρχήν. Third, there are incomplete sentences, as in Rom. 5:12, *Therefore as sin came into the world through one man and death through sin, and so death spread to all men because all men sinned,* and what follows; here in the whole periodic sentence there is no principal verb. Fourth, there are distorted sentences, like Gen. 10:32, *These are the families of the sons of Shem, by their families, their languages, their lands, and their nations.* For, immediately following is the beginning of chapter 11, *Now the whole earth had one language and few words.* Fifth, there are expressions proper to the Hebrews, as in Ps. 89:29, *his throne as the days of heaven.* Likewise in Ps. 119:109, *my soul is in my hands continually,* and there are many more like these. Sixth, there are many figurative statements, tropes, metaphors, allegories, hyperboles, ironies, and others of the same kind without number.

Finally there is the testimony of the adversaries, which willy-nilly forces them to admit this truth. For, if Scripture were so clear, as they say, why did Luther and the Lutherans write so many commentaries? Why have they published such different versions of Scripture? Why do they explain Scripture in such different ways? Certainly Osiander in his refutation of a writing, which Philippus had published against him, says that there are twenty different opinions about justification according to the Scriptures just among the Confessionists. And Luther himself in book 1 against Zwingli and Oecolampadius wrote this: *If the world were to last longer, it would again be necessary, because of the different interpretations of Scripture which exist now, in order to preserve the unity of faith, for us to accept the decrees of the Councils, and to have recourse to them.* And, I ask, where do so many interpretations of Scripture come from, if Scripture is so easy and clear? Why do they fight with each other so intensely over this matter?

Luther in one of his articles said that Scripture of itself is intelligible and clear; and in his book on free choice he said that there are no difficulties in the sacred Writings, and that no text could be proposed to him that he could not easily interpret. We find the same idea in his preface to the Psalms, where he said: *I do not wish that it should be presumed about me by anyone, which no one hitherto has been able to do concerning the holy and*

learned Psalms, that I cannot understand and teach their true meaning. It is sufficient to have understood some of them and those partially. The Spirit has reserved many things to himself, so that he might always keep us as disciples; many things he only shows in order to attract, many things he hands on in order to move us. And after that: *I know that it is a mark of impudent temerity for anyone to dare to say that he has understood one book of Scripture in all of its parts.* And in his book on the Council (page 12) he said: *Twenty years ago I was forced to think little of the commentaries of the Fathers, since Scripture had to be read in the Schools, and we had to search with great effort for their true and genuine meaning.*

Brentius in the prolegomena against Peter a Soto said: *They talk nonsense when they say that Scripture is obscure, and therefore needs an interpretation.* And further on he says: *It is only for the impious and the unbelieving that the Scripture is obscure, but it is not for pious believers.* But he himself in the Confession of Wittenberg, in the chapter on sacred Scripture, says this: *It is not obscure that the gift of interpreting Scripture is not a matter of human prudence, but a gift of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is totally free, and he is not obligated to a certain kind of men, but he distributes his gifts to men according to his own good pleasure.*

But why, Brentius, I ask, is the gift of interpretation necessary, if, as you yourself just said, Scripture does not need any interpretation?

Now Martin Kemnitius in his Examination of session 4 of the Council of Trent said: *God wanted the gift of interpretation to be in the Church, which like the gift of healings, miracles and languages is not common to all.* And after that he said: *Gratefully and reverently we use the works of the Fathers, who have usefully illuminated many passages of Scripture with their commentaries.* Your parent Luther was indeed very grateful to the works of the Fathers, since in his book on the Council (page 52) he wrote that the commentaries of the Fathers are pieces of coal instead of gold. The Centuriatorians are no less opposed to Luther, even though they are rigid Lutherans (see Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 52), since they write the following: *The Apostles knew that the Scriptures cannot be understood without the Holy Spirit and an interpreter.* Now we will consider the arguments of Luther and Brentius.

CHAPTER II

THE OBJECTIONS OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE ANSWERED

They take their first objection from these words of Deut. 30:11: *This commandment which I command you this day is not too hard for you, neither is it far off It is not in heaven... neither is it beyond the sea, etc.* In these words the great facility of Scripture is shown: *So that it is not necessary,* Brentius said, *to conquer mountains and to go to Rome for the interpretation of the Scriptures.*

I respond that this text is usually understood in two ways. Several Fathers understand this text to be not about the facility of understanding the Scriptures, but about the facility of fulfilling the precepts of the Decalogue, because there is the assistance of grace. This is contrary to all Lutherans, who teach that the precepts of God are impossible to observe. In this way Tertullian explains it in book 4 against Marcion, Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others in their comments on Rom. 10:8-9, and Augustine in his book on perfect justice (see the next to last response).

Others, however, among whom is Abulensis in comments on this text, understand these words to be about the facility of knowing, not indeed the Holy Scriptures, which perhaps at that time did not yet exist, but only the precepts of the Decalogue, which, since they are natural can be easily understood; and those Jews especially could understand them easily, who heard Moses explaining them, and confessed that they understood everything, and promised that they would observe them. Therefore he adds: *The word is very near you; it is in your mouth and in your heart,* that is, in your heart, since you have already understood what must be done; and it is in your mouth, because you have confessed that you understand it. And there is no contradiction to this explanation in what David said in the quote given above, namely, that it was difficult for him to understand the Law of the Lord. For David, under the name of the Law, does not understand only the ten precepts, but all the divine Scriptures. The Lord also uses the same idea in the Gospel, when he says: *It is to fulfill the word that is written in their law, "they hated me without* cawe" (John 15:25).

The second argument is based on Ps. 19:9, *The ordinances of the Lord are true, enlightening the eyes,* and Ps. 118:105, *Thy word is a lamp to my feet.* And, *The unfolding of thy words, etc.* (v. 130). And Proverbs 6:23, *The commandment is a lamp and the teaching a light.*

I respond first: the author in this place is not dealing with all Scripture, but only with the precepts of the Lord, which are said to be enlightening, a lamp and a light. Not that they are easily understood, although this also is true; for, what is easier than *You shall love your neighbor?* But since they are understood and known they direct man in his actions. Secondly, it can be said that he is indeed talking about all the Scriptures, but that the Scriptures are said to be enlightening, a light and a lamp, not because they are easily understood, but because when they have been understood they enlighten the mind. For, the Prophet in Ps. 19 had spoken about the knowledge of the Philosophers, which they acquired from creatures, when he says: *The heavens are telling the glory of God, etc.*

Further on, in order to show that they did not arrive at that light which was obtained by those whom God deigns to instruct, and to whom he gave the written law, he adds: *the law of the Lord is perfect, reviving the soul, etc.* (v. 7). Similarly, in Ps. 119 he wants to demonstrate that the knowledge which is had from the revealed word of God is greater than that derived from creatures; and because of this he compared the word of God to a lamp, which in order to dissipate the darkness of the night is much more useful for us than the light of all the stars.

The third argument is Matt. 5:14: *You are the light of the world.* But if the Apostles are the light of the world, why is it that the preaching and Scriptures of the Apostles are not clear?

I respond: the Lord is speaking about the light of good example, probity and morals. For, he wanted the Apostles to be examples of holiness proposed to the whole world for imitation. Therefore, he adds immediately: *Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works.* For this, if the Lord were speaking about the light of doctrine it would not make sense that the Scriptures of the Apostles are very easy to understand but it does that having been understood they enlighten the mind, they instruct about lofty things and escape the darkness of all errors.

The fourth argument is from 2 Pet. 1:19: *We have the prophetic word made more sure. You will do well to pay attention to this as to a lamp shining in a dark place.*

I respond: in this place also the words of the Prophets are called a lamp, not because they are easily understood, but because, having been understood, they enlighten, and show the way to Christ, who is the true Sun of justice.

The fifth argument is from 2 Cor. 4:3: *And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled only to those who are perishing. In their case the god of this world has blinded the eyes of the unbelieving, to keep them from seeing the light of gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God.* Therefore Scripture is open and easy for all the faithful.

I respond: The Apostles is not speaking about the understanding of the Scriptures, but the knowledge and faith in Christ, which the Apostles were preaching. For, he had said in the previous chapter that there is a difference between the Old Testament and the New, namely, that in the Old men did not see the mysteries of Christ, the Incarnation, the passion, etc., except through the veil of figures and shadows. That is what the veil signified, with which Moses covered his face, when he spoke to the people; but in the New Testament, now that the figures have all been fulfilled, with an uncovered face we behold the gloiy of Christ, and there is no old woman, nor Christian boy, who does not know the God incarnate, who suffered, etc.

Therefore, someone can ask, if that is the case, why is it that after the preaching of the gospel still so many do not believe, and, especially the Jews, see nothing but shadows and figures? For this reason the Apostle sais that the gospel is veiled to certain persons because their internal eyes have been blinded by perverse affections, about which the Lord said in John 5:44, *How can you believe, who receive glory from one another?* Moreover, the God of this world is understood as a God who is the creator of material things distinct from the true God, as the Marcionists and Manicheans interpret it, as Chrysostom says here, but he also says that the phrase "of this world" should be joined, not with "God" but

with "unbelievers," as Ambrose, Chrysostom, and others say regarding this passage, and Augustine also in book 21, chapter 2 of his treatise against Faustus. Certainly the Devil is called the God of this world, not because he is God in the absolute sense, but because he is the God of the infidels, as it is said in Ps. 96, *The Gods of the nations are demons.* Augustine says this in book 21, chapter 9 against Faustus and Cyril against Oecumenius.

The sixth argument. St. Augustine says in book 2, chapter 6 of his books on Christian Doctrine: *Thus the Holy Spirit has magnificently and wholesomely modulated the Holy Scriptures so that the more open places present themselves to hunger and the more obscure places may deter a disdainful attitude. Hardly anything may be found in these obscure places which is not found plainly said elsewhere.*

I respond that St. Augustine did not add that "hardly" in vain. For, some very obscure things are found, which are never explained in the total Scripture, like a great part of the book of Revelation, the beginning and the end of Ezekiel, etc. Then this is very difficult, namely, to find something that is said very obscurely in one place, to be said clearly elsewhere. Otherwise, how could the same Augustine say in letter 119, chapter 21, that there is more that he does not know in the sacred Scriptures than what he knows? What about the situation concerning some texts, which seem very clear to us, and perhaps seem obscure to someone else? Therefore, Scripture alone does not suffice to eliminate controversies.

Certainly the words in Matt. 26:26, *This is my body,* seem to us to be so clear that the Evangelist could not have spoken more clearly. But to the Zwinglians they seem obscure and figurative. And the words in the same place, *Drink of it, all of you,* seem clear to us, and to Lutherans; they are explained in very different ways. For when we read Mark 14:23, *And they all drank of it,* which is understood to be about the twelve disciples, interpreting Scripture through Scripture we say that the Lord said to his twelve disciples: *All of you drink of this.* But Brentius in his prolegomena says clearly that here the command is not just for the Apostles, but also for all others that they should drink from the cup. And when we ask whether also the Turks, and the Jews, and infants should drink it? Then they add a gloss to the text: *All,* that is, *all believing adults.*

The seventh argument. The summary of all Scripture, which consists in the precepts of the Decalogue, the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Sacraments, has very clear testimonies in the Scriptures; therefore all Scripture is very clear.

I respond: The consequence and the antecedent are denied. I deny the consequence because, although everything in some way can be reduced to them, nevertheless in themselves they are obscure, as is clear from the prophecies of the prophets, from the Canticle of Canticles, from the letter to the Romans, from the book of Revelation, etc. But it is absolutely certain that the antecedent is false; for if the testimonies were so clear concerning all the articles of the Creed, and all the Sacraments, all controversies would have ended. But since there are very serious controversies about each article of the Creed, and each one of the Sacraments, not only do Catholics disagree with heretics over these matters, but also the heretics disagree among themselves.

The eighth argument. John Chrysostom in homily 3 on Lazarus, where he shows that the philosophers have spoken obscurely, goes on to say this: *But on the contrary the*

Apostles and Prophets made everything manifest, and the clear things they handed on they explained to all, like common teachers of the world, so that each person by himself could learn the things that were said just by reading them. Also in homily 3 on 2 Thess. he said: *Why is there any need for a preacher? All things are clear and open from the divine Scriptures; but because you are delicate hearers, looking for pleasure in your hearing, on this account you seek preachers.*

I respond: Chrysostom, in order to counter the inactivity of many who could, if they so wished, read the Scriptures with great fruit, was accustomed to use those exaggerations. For, in general in those places he says that the Scriptures are difficult. In homily 3 on Lazarus, before the words cited above, he says: *What advantage is there, if we do not understand the things contained in the books? In fact there is very much, and even if you do not understand some profound things there, nevertheless such reading produces great virtue.* And further on he admits that, when he says the Scriptures are easy, he is speaking only about the histories, and similar things. He also says that even these things are not clear and easy for all. *Take the book,* he said, *into your hands, read all the history, and what you understand commit to memory; things that are obscure and less evident review again and again. But if you are not able, after assiduous reading, to understand what is being said, then go to someone wiser, go to a teacher.* And in that homily 3 on 2 Thess., after the quoted words, he adds: *Can you tell me what the obscurity is? Are they not histories? Is it not because you know what is clear, so that you can investigate the things that are obscure? There are a thousand histories in the Scriptures, tell me one of them; but if you do not, they are only words and a pretext.* Likewise, in homily 10 on John he warns his listeners that, before they come to the lecture, they should read the text, and write down anything obscure, so they may get an explanation from the lecturer. Finally, in homily 44 on John he teaches very clearly that the Scriptures are obscure, as was said above.

The ninth argument. This is the difference between the Old and the New Testaments—that the Old Testament was a sealed book, as is said in Isa. 29, while the New Testament is an open book, as is said in Rev. 5, for the slain Lamb opens the book. For the argument in this matter, at the death of the Lord the curtain of the temple was torn as recorded in Matt. 27:51; and it is confirmed by Jerome in chapter 44 of Ezekiel, where he explains those passages of Scripture on the difficulty and ease of Scripture itself.

I respond that the difference between the Old Testament and the New consists in this, that then not only the thoughts of the Scriptures, but also the mysteries of Christ were not understood, because everything was covered over with figures, and for this reason in Isa. 29:11 it is said to be a sealed book, both for those who know how to read and for those who do not. But in the New Testament, because Christ fulfilled the figures and the prophecies, although many do not understand the thoughts of the Scriptures, still even peasants and women understand the mysteries of redemption. But that neither the Scriptures nor Jerome speak about the thought of Scripture is clear both from Origen in homily 12 on Exodus, where he says that it is still necessary that the Lamb of the tribe of Judah open for us the sealed books; and from Jerome himself, who in his letter to Paulinus on the monastic life says that still today the veil remains, not only on the face of

Moses, but also on the face of the Evangelists and Apostles, if we consider the difficulty of the Scriptures, and therefore that we should pray with the Prophet: *Open my eyes, and I will consider the wonders of your law* (Ps. 119:18).

The tenth argument is proper to Luther. The Fathers prove their own ideas from Scripture; but what is more known is not to be proved by what is less known. Therefore the Scriptures are clearer than the commentaries of the Fathers.

I respond: it is amazing why Luther, who so often rebukes the sophists, now does not hesitate to engage in sophistry. For, since the philosophers say that what is less known should be proved by what is more known, they are not talking about the knowledge of words, which consists in the clarity of thought, as we say that it is an idea, that is, an easier and clearer idea than a figurative one; but about the idea of the truth of the thing, which consists in this, that someone understands that what is said is true. Examples of this are motion and life. For, if you look at the words, it is equally easy to understand this sentence "a man lives" and "a man is moved." But with regard to what concerns the knowledge of the truth of the matter, it is easier to know that a man is moved, than to know that he lives. Therefore, in this way the Fathers confirm their ideas with the testimony of the Scriptures, because it is more known that what is contained in Scripture is true, than what is had in the Fathers. Nevertheless the same Fathers explain the Scriptures with their own Commentaries, because the words of Scripture are more obscure than the words of the Fathers.

The eleventh argument. The Fathers of the first Church read the Scriptures without commentaries. And later all the other ancient Fathers did the same. So to what purpose do we follow this new way of the commentaries?

I respond: the contrary is true, and Luther offers no example, but we can cite many such examples. I say, therefore, that the first Fathers, who lived immediately after the Apostles, did not read commentaries, because none existed; but they could approach living commentaries, that is, the Apostles and their disciples, and they did not want to understand the Scriptures on the basis of their own ingenuity. Thus Papias gives testimony about himself in the last chapter of book 3 of Eusebius's History, and Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of his Stromata, when he mentions his teachers as disciples of the Apostles, and among them especially Panthenus. Then Justin, and Irenaeus, and others began to write commentaries on the divine books, as Jerome says in his book on illustrious men in the chapter on John; similarly the ancient Fathers after that began to write, as Ruffinus says about Basil and Gregory in book 2, chapter 9 of his History, and Jerome about himself in the preface to his commentary on Ephesians. The same thing could be shown about all the others, if it were necessary.

CHAPTER III

A QUESTION IS PROPOSED ABOUT THE JUDGE OF CONTROVERSIES, AND AT THE SAME TIME THERE IS AN EXAMINATION OF THE SENSES OF THE SCRIPTURES

Since it has already been established that Scripture is obscure and needs an interpreter, that fact gives rise to another question: Whether the interpretation of Scripture should be sought from one visible and common judge, or should it be left to the choice of each individual? Surely this is a very grave question, and on it all the controversies depend in some way. Many have written about this question, but especially John Driedo in book 2, chapter 3 on ecclesiastical dogmas, John Cochlaeus in his book on the authority of Scripture and the Church; Cardinal Warmiensis in books 2 and 3 against the Prolegomena of Brentius, and Peter a Soto in the defense of his Confession against the same Prolegomena of Brentius (par. 2 and 3), and also Martin Peresius in his book on Tradition (assertions 2,3,4 and 5); Michael Medina in book 7 on the right Faith in God, and Melchior Cano in book 2, chapters 6, 7 and 8, in his book on Theological Places.

Therefore, in order to understand what this question is all about, it is necessary to clarify a few points; the first one has to do with the meanings of Scripture. For it is something proper to the divine Scriptures, because they have God as their author, that often they contain two senses—the literal or historical, and the spiritual or mystical. The literal sense is that which the words immediately express; the spiritual is that which refers to something other than what the words express immediately; this distinction is deduced from the Apostle in 1 Cor. 10:11 where he says that everything happened to the Jews as a warning for our instruction. And the things said literally about the exodus of the Jews from Egypt, on passing through the sea, on the manna which came down in the desert, on the water that flowed from the rock—these things he accommodates spiritually to Christians. Jerome teaches in his comments on Rev. and on Ezek. 2 that these two senses are signified by the book written on the inside and the outside.

Philo in his book on the theoretical life of suppliants, and Nazianzen in his letter to Nemesius compares the literal sense to the body and the spiritual sense to the soul. And just as the generated Word of God has an invisible divine nature and a visible human nature, so also the written word of God has an external and an internal sense. St. Gregory in book 21, chapter 1 in his *Magna Moralia* teaches that this is proper to the divine Scriptures alone.

Further, the literal sense is twofold: one simple, which consists in the property of the words, the other figurative, whereby the words are transferred from their natural meaning to something else. And there are as many kinds of this as there are different kinds of figures. Since the Lord says in John 10:16:*I have other sheep that are not of this fold, etc.,* that is the literal sense, but the figurative is that other persons besides the Jews must be brought into the Church. This is said directly in John 11:52 that he would gather into one the children of God who are scattered abroad. On these figures of speech see what Augustine says in book 3 on Christian Doctrine.

But the sense of Scripture is distinguished in three ways by more recent theologians:

allegorical, tropological and anagogical. They call the meaning allegorical, when the words of Scripture, besides the literal meaning, signify something in the New Testament, which pertains to Christ or to the Church, like Abraham who really and literally had two wives, one free and one a servant, and two sons, Isaac and Ishmael. It signified that God is the author of two Testaments, and the Father of two peoples, as the Apostle explains in Gal. 4. They call the meaning tropological, when the words or facts are used to signify something which pertains to morals. For example, Deut. 25:4 says, *You shall not muzzle an ox when it is treading out the grain,* which is understood literally to concern real oxen, but spiritually it means that preachers should not be prevented from receiving support from the people, as the Apostle explains in 1 Cor. 9:9-12. They call the meaning anagogical, when the words or facts are used to signify eternal life. For example, Ps. 95:11 says: *Therefore I swore in my anger that they should not enter my rest.* Literally this refers to the Promised Land, but spiritually it also refers to eternal life, as the Apostle explains in Heb. 4:3-11.

This distinction of the spiritual senses was not always observed by the ancient authors. For although they recognize, in what pertains to the reality, all of these meanings, nevertheless sometimes they call all of them allegories, like Basil at the beginning of homily 9 on Examination, and Augustine in chapter 3 in his work on the Creed. Moreover, Jerome, in his letter to Hedibias (question 12), by the word "tropological" understands also the allegorical, and then in his comments on Amos 4 by the word "allegorical" he understands what is tropological.

Among these meanings, the literal is found in eveiy sentence, both of the Old and of the New Testament. And it is not improbable that sometimes several meanings are found in the same sentence, as St. Augustine teaches in many places, and especially in book 12, chapter 26 if his *Confessions,* in book 11, chapter 19 of *The City of God,* and in book 3, chapter 27 on *Christian Doctrine.* But the spiritual meaning is found in both Testaments. For, no one doubts that the Old Testament has the allegorical, tropological and anagogical senses. Many think the same thing about the New Testament and rightly so. For Augustine explains in an allegorical way, in his treatise 122 on John, the capture of the fish, when the net was tom (Luke 5:6), but in an anagogical way when the net was not tom (John 21:6). And similarly in treatise 124 on John, he explains allegorically what was said to Peter, *Follow me* (John 21:19), and anagogically what was said about John, *If it is my will that he remain, etc.* (John 21:22). But the Lord explains tropologically his own humility, because of which he washed his disciples' feet (John 13:14f.).

Although these cases do occur, still a spiritual sense is not found in every sense of Scripture, neither in the Old Testament nor in the New. For, the expression, *You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart,* in Deut. 6:5 and Matt. 22:37, and similar precepts, have only one meaning, that is, a literal one, as Cassian rightly teaches in Collation 8, chapter 3. That being the case, there is agreement among us and our adversaries that effective arguments should be sought only from the literal sense. For it is certain that the sense which is derived immediately from the words is the sense of the Holy Spirit. But the mystical and spiritual senses are various, and although they edify when they are not against Faith and good morals, nevertheless it is not always certain that they are intended

by the Holy Spirit. Therefore, St. Augustine in letter 48 to Vincent rightly ridicules the Donatists, who give a mystical explanation of these words: *Tell me where you pasture yourflock, where you make it lie down at noon* (Cantic. 1:6), because they conclude from this that the Church ofChrist has survived only in Africa. Also Jerome in his commentary on Matt. 13 says that the dogmas of the Faith cannot be effectively proved from the mystical meanings of Scripture.

But with regard to the literal sense, sometimes there can be doubts for two reasons. The first is the ambiguity ofthe words, such as is seen in Matt. 26:27, *Drink ofit, all of you.* That phrase "all of you" is ambiguous, if only those words are considered. For, it is not known whether it signifies absolutely all men, or only all the faithful, or all the Apostles. The second and more serious doubt concerns the property of the words. For since the literal sense sometimes is (as we have said) simple, and sometimes figurative, it is doubtful in many places whether the true sense is simple or figurative. For regarding the words in Matt. 26:26, *This is my body,* Catholics want them to be understood simply according to the property of the words, but the Zwinglians take them as the figure of metonymy. And for this reason at times some people fall into very grave errors. Origen is an example of this, who erred because what should be taken simply, he understood figuratively, as Jerome says in his letter to Pammachius on the errors of John of Jerusalem, where he says that Origen so allegorized the earthly Paradise that he removed its historical truth, since he understands angels for the trees, and the heavenly Virtues for the rivers; and he interprets the skin clothing ofAdam and Eve as their human bodies, as if before their sin they were living without a body.

On the other hand, others have fallen into error, because they have taken something simply which should be understood figuratively, like Papias, and those who followed him—Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius and some others; they thought that what is said in Rev. 20 about the New Jerusalem, and the thousand years during which the saints will reign with Christ, will be fulfilled here on earth. Jerome refutes their error in the preface to his book on Isaiah 18, and on Ezekiel 36; Augustine does the same in book 20, chapter 7 of *The City ofGod.*

There is also agreement between us and our adversaries that the Scriptures must be understood in the same spirit in which they were made, that is, in the Holy Spirit. The Apostle Peter teaches this when he says in 2 Pet. 1:20-21: *First ofall you must understand this, that no prophecy ofScripture is a matter ofone's own interpretation, because no prophecy ever came by the impulse ofman, but men moved by the Holy Spirit spokefrom God.* St. Peter proves there that the Scriptures should not be explained from one's own cleverness, but according to the direction ofthe Holy Spirit, because the Scriptures do not come from human genius, but from the inspiration ofthe Holy Spirit.

Therefore this whole question comes down to where the Spirit is. For, we think that this Spirit, although he is often conferred on many individual persons, nevertheless is certainly found in the Church, that is, in a Council of the Bishops confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiffofthe whole Church, or in the Sovereign Pontifftogether with a council ofthe other Pastors. For, we do not want to debate in this place concerning the Sovereign Pontiffand the Councils, whether the Pontiffalone can define something, and whether a

Council alone can do it; we will treat this matter in its proper place. But here we wish to say in general that the judge of the true sense of Scripture and of all controversies is the Church, that is, the Pontiff with a Council, and about this all Catholics are in agreement; and it is stated expressly in session 4 of the Council of Trent.

But all the heretics of this time teach that the Holy Spirit is the interpreter of Scripture, and that he is not tied to the Bishops, or to any group of men, and therefore that each person should be the judge, either by following his own spirit if he has the gift of interpreting, or by following someone else whom he sees is endowed with this same gift. In the preface to his article on this matter, Luther clearly refers us to the spirit, which each person has, while he is carefully reading the Scriptures. And in article 115 which Cochlaeus gathered together from the works of Luther, he says the following: *This is a key point of the Gospels, since it has not been granted either to Councils or to any group of men to establish and to conclude what the Faith is; therefore I must say, Father, you have finished with the Councils, so now I have to make the judgment whether I can accept them or not. Why is that? Because you will not stand up for me and respond for me when I must die. And no one can judge false doctrine except the spiritual man. Therefore this matter is insane, that the Councils want to deduce and decree what must be believed, since often there is no man who can detect the divine Spirit even in a small way.* He repeats the same idea in his assertions, articles 27, 28 and 29.

Philippus, in his chapter on the Church, seems indeed to attribute something to the Church; but really he leaves the whole judgment to each private person. *Who,* he said, *will be the judge, when dissent arises over the meaning of Scripture, since then it is necessary to have a voice to put an end to the controversy? I respond—the word of God itself is the judge, and the confession of the true Church is added to it.* That is what he says there. But further on, when he teaches that by the true Church he does not mean the Prelates of the Church, nor the major part of the faithful, but those few men who are familiar with the word of God; he covers everything with obscurity and he makes each person his own judge. For I cannot judge which is the true Church, unless I first judge which opinion is in agreement with the word of God: *There is,* he said, *a difference between the judges of the Church and political judges. For, in politics, either the Monarch alone pronounces something by his authority, or in a Senate the opinion of the majority prevails; but in the Church what prevails is the opinion agreeing with the word of God, and the confession of the pious, whether they are more or fewer than the impious.* See more on this in the place on the notes of the Church.

Brentius teaches something similar in the Confession of Wittenberg, in the chapter on sacred Scripture and more extensively in the Prolegomena against Peter a Soto, where he says two things. First: *It is not allowed,* he said, *in the matter of eternal salvation to so adhere to the opinion of another that we embrace it without our own judgment.* Secondly he adds: *It pertains to each private person to judge about the doctrine of religion, and to distinguish what is true from what is false. But there is this difference between a private person and a Prince, that just as a private person has the private power of judging and deciding, so the Prince has the public power of judging about the doctrine of religion.* And he tries to prove these two points in almost the whole book, namely, that the secular

Prince should force his subjects, even with the punishment of death, to embrace the Faith which he judges to be true. And at the same time he says that the subjects should follow their own judgment, not that of another, whomsoever he may be. And Brentius does not recognize how absurd and conflicting these view are, namely, that the Prince must command, and that the subjects must not obey. Nor has he realized that, if this opinion is true, Caesar would be acting rightly, and the other Catholic Princes of Germany, if they also force all Lutherans, with the threat of the punishment of death, to adopt the Catholic Faith.

John Calvin in book 4, chapter 9 § 8, 12 and 13 in his Institutes orders that the definitions of the Councils, even the General ones, are to be examined exactly in the light of the Scriptures. Therefore he makes individual men the judges in matters of faith, not only of the Fathers, but also of the Councils, and he does not allow for any common judgment of the Church. Finally, Martin Kemnitius, in his examination of session 4 of the Council of Trent, and all the other contemporary heretics, remove the authority of interpreting Scripture from the Councils of Bishops and confer it on the spirit of private individuals.

CHAPTER IV

TESTIMONIES FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT ARE CITED FOR THE OPINION OF CATHOLICS

Now the thought of Catholics is proved; first, by testimonies from the Old Testament. The first testimony is found in Exod. 18:13f., for there we read that, when the people began to be established as a kind of ecclesiastical Republic, Moses presided as the leader and head of that assembly, and he would respond to all doubts that arose concerning the law of the Lord, nor did he refer men to some revealing spirit. In the same place: when, according to the counsel of his father-in-law, he had constituted minor magistrates who would judge the people, he always reserved to himself doubts about religion. Actually, he did this so that we might understand that there should be one common tribunal from which all seek the interpretation of the divine law, and with which all simply agree.

This argument is wont to be evaded by certain authors who say: Moses was a political leader, not a Pontiff or Priest, since Aaron was the High Priest. And therefore from this passage it cannot be concluded that judgment about the matters of faith pertains to priests, but rather in a certain way it pertains to Kings. I respond: Moses was a priest, in fact a High Priest, and greater than Aaron, but he was not a priest in the ordinary sense with successors, for there could be only one like that and that was Aaron; but Moses was an extraordinary priest who had been constituted specially by God. Just as in the New Testament all the Apostles were not indeed greater than Peter, nor completely equal to him, but still in some sense they were equal to Peter in ecclesiastical power, as Cyprian says in his treatise on the simplicity of Prelates. However, there is this difference—that Peter was the ordinary Pastor of the whole Church, who alone was to have successors; the others were extraordinary Pastors who were not to have successors in their special powers. David bears witness to the fact that Moses was a priest, since he says in Ps. 99:6, *Moses and Aaron were among his priests, Samuel also was among those who called upon his name.*

But, they say: Moses is said to be a priest, because he was a distinguished man, as we read in 2 Sam. 8:18 that the sons of David were priests. The contrary is true: because if in this place distinguished men were called priests, Samuel also, who was a distinguished man, would have been called a priest. But David did not do that, because he knew that Samuel was not a priest, but only a judge; for he did not descend from the family of Aaron, since Kohath was his cousin (1 Chron. 6:3). But it is clear from Exod. 28 and 29, where Moses exercises all the sacerdotal offices, that Moses really and truly was a Priest. That is so because he offers sacrifice, teaches, consecrates clothing, and what is even more important, he anoints and initiates Pontiffs and Priests. Therefore almost all the Fathers teach that Moses was a priest in the proper sense. The same point is made by Philo in book 3 on the life of Moses, Dionysius in chapter 5 of the Church hierarchy, Gregoiy Nazianzen in his sermon in the presence of Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine on Ps. 99, Jerome in his book of Jovinian, where he also shows that Samuel was not a priest.

The second testimony is found in Deut. 17:8-12, where a general law is proclaimed: *If any case arises requiring decision between one kind of homicide and another, one*

kind of legal right and another, or one kind of assault and another, any case within your towns which is too difficult for you, then you shall arise and go up to the place which the Lord your God will choose, and coming to the Levitical priests, and to the judge who is in office in those days, you shall consult them, and they shall declare to you the decision. Then you shall do according to what they declare to you from that place which the Lord shall choose; and you shall be careful to do according to all that they direct you; according to the instructions which they give you, and according to the decision which they pronounce to you, you shall do; you shall not turn aside from the verdict which they declare to you, either to the right or to the left. The man who acts presumptuously, by not obeying the priest who stands to minister there before the Lord your God, or the judge, that man shall die. Here also it is very clear that those in doubt are not referred to their own spirit, but to a living judge, that is, the High Priest.

But Brentius will object: that precept is conditional, because he adds: *You shall do according to what they declare to you from that place... and you shall be careful to do all that they direct you according to his Law.* For it seems to be concluded from this place that one must not abide by the judgment of the High Priest, unless he provides the testimony of the divine Law. I respond: that phrase, *all that they direct you, etc.,* is found only in the Vulgate edition, which Lutherans do not accept, and it is not a condition, but an assertion or promise: for he did not want to say, *Abide by the judgment of the priest, if he directs you according to the Law;* for then men would be more doubtful and perplexed than they were before; and it would not have been necessary to go to the priest, if they could judge their own case by themselves on the basis of the Law. Indeed, then the priest would not have been the judge, but they themselves, since they would be the ones to judge the decision of the priest. Therefore it is not a condition, but a promise, for the Lord wants to make the people secure, when they accept the judgment of the priest; and this is what he does, since he affirms that they will be judged according to his Law.

Brentius objects a second time: he says in this place that those who have doubts are sent not only to the priest, but also to the judge who was a political leader. I respond that the word "judge" here can be understood as the High Priest. For in Hebrew it is, *You shall go to the priests and to the judge,* as if he were to say, to the council of priests and their chief, the High Priest. In the second place I say: if we understand by the word "judge" a political leader, then here there would be distinct offices. For, the definitive decision belongs to the priest, but the execution belongs to the judge in the case of the obstinate. *The man who acts presumptuously,* he said, *by not obeying the priest and the decree of the judge shall die.*

There is a third objection: here it is not a matter of religious doubts, but political. I respond: that is false. For the general law is about all the doubts, which arise because of the Law. Moreover, the occasion of this law was because of those who worship foreign gods, as is clear from the beginning of chapter 17 that it is contrary to religion to be serving foreign gods.

The third testimony is in Eccles. 12:11: *The sayings of the wise are like goads, and like nails firmly fixed are the collected sayings which are given by one Shepherd. My son, beware of anything beyond these.* In this place Solomon is teaching that there should be

no further inquiiy, but only complete agreement, when a decision has been given by the supreme Shepherd, especially when the counsel of the wise is added to it. But if this is said about the priest of the Old Testament, how much more can it be said about the priest of the New Testament, who has received much greater promises from God?

The fourth testimony is in Haggai 2:11 : *Thus says the Lord of hosts: Ask the priests about the law.* And Malachi 2:7: *The lips of a priest should guard knowledge, and men should seek instruction from his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord of hosts.* From these words we understand that it does not belong to individual men to judge about the decree of the Law of the Lord, but to the priest, who, since he is an angel, that is, a messenger of God, has the right officially to explain the law of God.

Finally, in 2 Chron. 19:10-11, the good King Jehoshaphat speaks thus to the Priests: *Whenever a case comes to you from your brethren who live in their cities, concerning bloodshed, law or commandment, statutes or ordinances, then you shall instruct them, that they may not incur guilt before the Lord and wrath may not come upon you and your brethren. Thus you shall do, and you will not incur guilt. And behold, Amariah the chief priest is over you in all matters of the Lord; and Zebadiah the son of Ishmael, the governor of the house of Judah, in all the king's matters.* You can see here how clearly the King distinguishes the office of Priest from the office of King, and he attributes to the Priest alone judgment about doubts of the Law.

CHAPTER V

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

Now from the New Testament. The first testimony is Matt. 16:19: *I will give you the keys to the kingdom of heaven, etc.* For, by those keys is understood not only the power of forgiving sins, but also to free men from all other chains and impediments, which, if they are not removed, one cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. Since the promise is general, and it is not said, *whomever you loose,* but *whatever you loose,* so that we may understand that all difficulties can be solved by Peter and his successors, either by dispensing from the laws, or by forgiving sins and punishments, or by explaining dogmas and resolving controversies. We will say more about this in book 1 of our treatise on the Sovereign Pontiff.

Another testimony can be found in Matt. 18:17: *If he refuses to listen even to the Church, let him be to you as a Gentile and a tax collector.* But in this place it should be noted that the Lord is talking about the injuries which one man suffers from another; but even more it is to be understood about the injuries which are inflicted on the whole Church, and on God, such as heresy. For, he orders that the adulterer should be subjected to the judgment of the Church, and even more so the heretic. But it cannot happen that they be brought before the assembly of all the faithful; therefore the word "Church" here should be understood to mean the Prelate, as Chrysostom explains it, or (as others prefer) the assembly of Prelates. For, just as a man does not speak or hear, except by his head, but still the whole man is said to speak and to hear, so also the Church through her Prelates hears and speaks. Therefore, if someone does not listen to the Church, that is, the Pastors of the Church, he should be like a Gentile or a tax collector; it follows that the final judgment belongs to the Pastors.

The third testimony is in Matt. 23:2: *The scribes and Pharisees sit on Moses'seat; so practice and observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do.* Please note three things here. First, that in that whole chapter the Lord is rebuking the vices of the scribes and Pharisees, and that the weak could conclude therefrom that it is not necessary to believe Prelates who live an evil life. Therefore, at the beginning of the chapter he wants to teach clearly that, notwithstanding the evil life of some Prelates, their teaching must be followed. Secondly, observe with Cyprian in book 4, letter 9, that neither the Lord nor the Apostles, in all of Scripture, ever rebuke the Pontiffs and Priests of the Jews, by calling them Pontiffs and Priests, but only under the title of scribes and Pharisees; they do this lest they seem to blame the chair and the priesthood, and so that we may understand that honor is always due to the priesthood and pontificate, even if perhaps some person, who occupies the chair, is less worthy. From this we understand that contemporaiy heretics, who passim are found among Bishops and Priests, and especially in the highest place io the Church, have nothing in common with the mores of the Lord and the Apostles.

Thirdly, note that what the Lord says about the chair of Moses is to be understood a fortiori of the chair of Peter. For thus the ancients understood it, and especially Augustine in letter 165. *In the order of Bishops,* he said, *which has existed from Pd&*

until Anastasins, who now occupies the same chair, even if a traitor during that time had crept in, that would be no prejudice against the Church, and innocent Christians, to whom the provident Lord says about evil commanders: Do what they say, but do not do what they do.

The fourth testimony is in John 21:16: *Simon Peter, feed my sheep.* Here also three points should be noted. First, what is said to Peter is said also to his successors: for Christ did not want to provide for his Church for 25 years only, but for as long as the world exists. Second, that word "feed" is to be understood especially about doctrine; for in this way rational sheep are fed. On this see Jer. 3:15: *I will give you shepherds after my own heart, who will feed you with knowledge and understanding.* Third, the word "sheep" signifies all Christians, for anyone who does not want to be fed by Peter, is not one of Christ's sheep.

From this we conclude that it has been committed to Peter and his successors to teach all Christians. But this cannot be understood in a better way than this—that Peter and his successors have been commissioned to teach all what must be held regarding the doctrine of the faith. For, if we understand it to be only about sermons, this precept will never be fulfilled, for the Pontiff cannot preach to all men, nor is it necessary, since there are men in each Church who do the preaching.

Also, if we understand this to be about commentaries on the sacred Writings, so that, whom the Pontiff cannot teach with words, he teaches by written commentaries, then we are reprehending several very holy Pontiffs, who did not do that. Therefore, the Lord is speaking about the special office of teaching the whole Church, by establishing what must be believed by all. But it is in this way that this text was understood by St. Jerome in his letter to Damasus on the word "Hypostasis," because he was seeking an explanation of a certain controversy concerning the Son: *From the Shepherd,* he said, *I ask earnestly for the protection of a sheep.*

The fifth testimony is in Luke 22:31: *I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.* From this text St. Bernard in letter 90 to Innocent deduced that the Roman Pontiff, teaching *ex cathedra,* cannot err; and before him the same was said by Lucius I in letter 1 to the Bishops of Spain and France, Felix I in a letter to Benignus, Mark in a letter to Athanasius, Leo I in sermon 3 on his acceptance of the Pontificate, Leo IX in a letter to Peter, Patriarch of Antioch, Agatho in a letter to the Emperor Constantine in the Fourth Synod which nd was approved by the whole Council, Paschal II at the Roman Council, which is found in the Chronicle of the Abbot Urspergensis; to these I add, whether the heretics agree or not, Innocent III in the chapter *Majores* on Baptism and its effect. Therefore, if the Roman Pontiff cannot err when he is teaching *ex cathedra,* certainly his judgment must be followed, and he must be the supreme Judge.

The sixth testimony is in Acts 15:6ff. For we read there, when a serious question about the Faith had arisen, namely, whether the Law of Moses must be observed by the Gentile converts, that each person was not referred to his own spirit, but to the Council held in Jerusalem, over which Peter presided. We read that Peter, the first of all, spoke at the Council and then that James confirmed the thinking of Peter, and so the question

was resolved with these words: *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us, etc.* With these words they show that the decision of the Council, over which Peter presided, is the decision of the Holy Spirit. And in the same chapter we read that Paul, wherever he went, was wont to preach that the decree of that Council should be observed, that is, that they should accept it and not wish to pass judgment on the decree of the Council.

The seventh testimony is in the letter to the Galatians 2:1ff.: *I went up again,* said Paul, *with Barnabas... and I laid before them (but privately before those who were of repute) the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, lest somehow I should be running or had run in vain.* But who those men were with whom he consulted, he explains later, saying that it was Peter, James and John. In their explanation of this passage Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion, St. Jerome in letter 89 to Augustine, which is 11 among the letters of Augustine, and Augustine himself in book 28, chapter 4 against Faustus say clearly that the Church would not give credence to Paul unless his gospel was confirmed by Peter. Therefore it was Peter then, and so his successors now, who pass judgment on the doctrine of the Faith.

The eighth testimony is in 1 Cor. 12:8-10: *To one is given through the Spirit the utterance of wisdom, and to another the utterance of knowledge, to another the interpretation of tongues, to another prophecy, etc.* Here it is said clearly that the spirit of interpreting the Scriptures is not given to all the faithful. Also, it is certain from 2 Pet. 1:20, *no prophecy of Scripture is a matter of one's own interpretation,* that Scripture cannot be explained well without the spirit of interpretation. Therefore it is evidently deduced that no private person is the judge of the true meaning of Scripture. So what does the person do who does not have this spirit? In fact, who will be certain that he has this spirit, since we know that it is not given to all, and we do not know to whom it is given? Therefore, the conclusion is that we acknowledge the Church alone as the judge, about which there cannot be any doubt that she does have the Spirit of God, and that she teaches her children without error, since she is the pillar and foundation of truth. This is something that even Luther confesses in his book on the power of the Pope with these words: (in spite of what he wrote elsewhere, since is an amazing way he was changeable and unstable) *Of no private man do we have certitude whether or not he has the revelation of the Father; but the Church is the one about whom it is not permitted to doubt.* But the Church does not speak otherwise than through the mouth of her Pastors and doctors, and especially in a general Council of Bishops. Such a Council will have either the Sovereign Pontiff present and presiding, or his confirmation, and it must obtain his approbation.

But, they say, that man is certain that he has the spirit who asks for it. For it is written: *How much more will the heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to those who ask him* (Luke 11:13); and also James 1:5: *If any of you lacks wisdom, let him ask God, who gives to all men generously.* I respond that here and in similar places the Lord is not talking about the spirit of interpretation, which is a certain freely given grace, but about the spirit of Faith, Hope and Charity, and the Wisdom necessary for salvation. For, as St. Augustine teaches in tracts 73, 81 and 103 on John, prayer does not obtain infallibly except what is necessary or useful for salvation for the person who prays. Moreover, the gift of interpreting, like the gift of tongues and miracles, and the other gifts mentioned

there, are not always helpful for the one who has them.

Therefore, just as we cannot always obtain the Spirit of speaking in tongues, or performing miracles, even though it is written: *the Holy Spirit will give good things to those who ask him,* so also neither the spirit of interpretation. For otherwise it would come about that the whole body of the Church would be one member, that is, all would be eyes, all hands, etc., which is opposed to what the Apostle says in Rom. 12:4 and 1 Cor. 12:14f. Furthermore, even if the Lord in those texts were speaking about the gift of interpreting, still it would not be certain that whoever asks for it receives it, because it is not certain whether or not he asks well. For it is written: *You ask and do not receive, because you ask wrongly* (James 4:3). Otherwise when Lutherans ask for that spirit, Anabaptists ask for it, Zwinglians ask for it, why is it that they receive spirits that are very different and fighting with each other, if that one and true Holy Spirit is given to all who ask for it?

The ninth testimony is in 1 John 4:1: *Beloved, do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God; for many false prophets have gone out into the world.* The spirit of private men should be tested, whether it is of God; for, many boast about having the Holy Spirit, who are moved by a spirit of giddiness and lies, as is said in 1 Kings 22,2 Chron. 18, and Isaiah 19 and 29. Therefore a private spirit cannot be the judge. For, how can he be a judge, since judgment must still be pass on him?

Therefore, if someone explains the words, *This is my body,* by saying it means, *This signifies my body,* because in this sense the spirit is revealing it to him, the matter is still not finished. For John warns us that we should test that spirit whether it is of God, lest perhaps is may be a spirit of giddiness.

But this cannot be proved from Scripture, as they claim, because in this place we can doubt about the meaning of Scripture itself. Therefore it must be proved from its conformity with the spirit of those concerning whom it is certain that they have the true spirit; but such persons are the Prelates lawfully assembled together in a Council. For, we read in Acts 15:28, *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us.* Now such is the Pontiff teaching *ex cathedra,* whom we have shown is always guided by the Holy Spirit, so that he cannot err. Such also were the Apostles and the first faithful, concerning whom it is certain that they had the Holy Spirit.

Calvin cannot deny this, because he argues in the same way in his Institutes 1, chapter 9 § 1 against Swenexfeldius, who wanted the spirit alone to be the judge, while repudiating the Scriptures. If that spirit were good, it would be the same as the spirit of the Apostles, and of the first faithful; but their spirit did not want to be the judge, while contemning the Scriptures. But in this way also we can argue against Calvin and other heretics: If their spirit were good, it would be the same as the spirit of the Apostles and the first faithful; but the spirit of the latter did not want to be judge, but it appealed to Peter and the Council, and it accepted their decision, as we showed above from Acts 15. Therefore their spirit, which establishes itself as judge, is not a good spirit.

CHAPTER VI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE USUAL PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH

In the third place, it is proved from the praxis of the Church. For, in every century new doubts have arisen in the Church, and they have always been decided in the same way that is, by the judgment of the Roman Pontiff and of the Bishops of that time. Therefore it is not right to say or write that, what the universal Church always did and does, i arrogant madness, as St. Augustine says in letter 118.

And please note that we are saying not only that all cases were judged by the Romai Pontiff and the Bishops, but by the Pontiff and Bishops living at that time. For, a new Pope and new Bishops were never created in order to judge some doubtful matter. We say that because of the Confessionists (= Protestants), who in the confession of Augsburç (article 28) say that it pertains to the Bishops to discern the true doctrine from the false But when we ask, therefore why do you not agree with the Council of Trent?, they say that those who are living now are not true Bishops but are enemies of the Gospel. Bui this same thing was said by the Arians and the other heretics about the Bishops during their time; but in spite of this, already for 1500 years religious doubts have always been resolved by the Bishops, who according to the ordinary succession were active in the Churches, when those doubts were raised; and those who did not agree with them are considered heretics.

Therefore in the first century of the Church, which covers the period to the year 100 after the birth of Christ, the question about the ceremonies of the old Law arose- whether they should be observed by the Gentiles converted to Christ. And as that was the first question to surface in the Church, so the first Council was held, under the presidency of Peter, and all accepted the decree of this Council (see Acts 15).

In the second century, that is, up to the year 200, the question was raised about the celebration of Easter, since some wanted to celebrate Easter with the Jews on the fourteenth day of the month, whether it was a Sunday or not, but others wanted it only on Sunday. On account of this, it is certain that many Councils of Bishops were convened, and finally the question was settled in such a way by Victor, the Roman Pontiff, that all the Churches of Asia were excommunicated by him, which persisted in error. Eusebius in book 5, chapter 23 of his History writes up this whole history. Afterwards, those not only were considered excommunicated but also heretical, who did not obey the decree of the Pontiff. Hence we find that in Epiphanius's book on heresies (50), in Augustine on the heretics (29), and in Tertullian on prescription (at the end), the Quartodecimani are numbered among the heretics.

In the third centuiy, that is, after the year 200, the heresy of the Novatians appeared; they denied that the Church can absolve from their sins those who had fallen after their Baptism. But the truth was explained by the Roman Council, over which Pope Cornelius presided, as Eusebius reports in the version of Ruffinus in book 6, chapter 33 of his History, and after that the Novatians were always held to be heretics. In the same centuiy the question arose about re-baptism; and since there were different opinions about this,

Cornelius, having assembled a Council in Rome, decreed that those who had been baptized by heretics were not to be re-baptized, as Eusebius recounts in book 7, chapter 2 of his History; after that, Pope Stephen also wrote and ordered that those are not to be re-baptized, who had been baptized by heretics according to the rite of the Church. Cyprian mentions this decree in his letter to Pompey, and St. Augustine in book 5, chapter 23 of his treatise on Baptism, and Vincent of Lérins in his Commentary.

In the fourth century after the year 300 the heresy of the Arians occurred, which was condemned by the general Council of Nicaea. 318 Bishops were present, and only they were the judges together with the Legates of the Roman See, Vitone and Vincent Preshyteris, who together with Hosius, the Bishop of Cordova, presided over the Council in the name of Sylvester, the Pope; afterwards the whole Council by a letter sought confirmation by Sylvester. The Emperor was indeed present, but he did not function as a judge in any way. All of these points are evident both in Tome 1 of the Council, and from the historians Eusebius in book 3 on the life of Constantine, Ruffinus, Socrates, Sozomenus and Theodoretus in book 1 of the Ecclesiastical History.

In the same century the heresy of Macedonius against the Holy Spirit was judged and condemned by the Council of Constantinople I, which Photius in his book on the seven Synods says was condemned by Damasus; this book is usually included at the beginning of the first Tome on the Councils.

In the fifth century the heresy of Nestorius was condemned by the Council of Ephesus, presided over by Cyril in the name of Pope Celestine, as Evagrius says in chapter 4 of his book. And shortly thereafter the heresy of Eutyches in the Council of Chalcedon, where the Legates of Pope Leo presided, as Evagrius reports in book 2, chapter 4. And confirmation of this Council was also sought from the Roman Pontiff, and neither in this Council nor in the previous one do we read that there was any endorsement of the Emperor or of any lay persons, but only of Ecclesiastics. On this, see Tomes 1 and 2 on the Councils, and the Breviarium Liberati.

In the same century the heresy of the Pelagians was condemned, which Lutherans seem to have hated more than others, but it was condemned by the Roman Pontiffs. Thus St. Augustine says this in book 2, chapter 50 of his *Retractions: The Pelagian heresy with its authors was reviled and condemned by the Bishops of the Roman Church, first by Innocent and then by Zozimus, with the cooperation of the writings of the African Councils.* And in the Chronicle Prosper said in 420: *At the Council held in Carthage more than 217 Bishops sent their synodal decrees to Pope Zozimus; after his approval the Pelagian heresy was condemned throughout the whole world.*

In the sixth century many heresies were condemned by the fifth Council, in which only Bishops were present as judges.

In the seventh century the Monothelites were condemned by the sixth general Council, over which the Roman Legates presided; the Emperor of course was present and endorsed it, but only after all the Bishops, and not by judging or defining, as the Bishops had signed it, but only by consenting to it.

In the eighth century the Iconoclasts were condemned at the seventh Council, over which the Legates of the Roman Pontiff presided, and at it no signing of lay persons is

recorded. On these Councils read the Tomes of the Councils, and the book of Photius on the seven Synods.

In the ninth century certain ecclesiastical controversies were defined by the eighth Council, which was presided over by the Legates of the Roman Pontiff. The Emperor was present, and he did sign it after the Pontifical Legates and the Patriarchs, but in the same place he said clearly that it did not pertain to him to pass judgment on divine things, but only to subscribe as a sign of his agreement, etc. Later on we will make a reference to his words.

In the tenth century, which is the most obscure of all, no heresy surfaced, and because of that we do not read about the holding of any Council; however, the schism, and the error of the Greeks, which began at this time, grew strong especially in this century, and we will soon say something about its condemnation.

In the eleventh century Leo IX condemned the heresy of Berengarius at the Council of Vercellae, and Nicholas II afterwards at the Roman Council, as Lantfrancus and Guitmundus recount in book 1 against Berengarius.

In the twelfth century the heresy of Peter Abelard was condemned by Innocent II, as is recorded in letter 194 of St. Bernard. Also, the error of Gilbert Porretanus was condemned by Eugene III at the Council of Rheims, according to St. Bernard in sermon 80 on the Song of Songs.

In the thirteenth century the error of the Abbot Joachim was condemned by Innocent III at the general Lateran Council. And afterwards the error of the Greeks by Gregory X at the general Council of Lyons. From that we have the chapter *Fideli* on the holy Trinity and the Catholic faith (6).

In the fourteenth century the errors of the Beghards were condemned at the Council of Vienne by Clement V. From that we have the chapter *Ad nostrum* in Clement's work on the heretics.

In the fifteenth century the errors of John Wycliffe and John Hus were condemned by the Council of Constance; Martin V presided. And again the errors of the Greeks at the Council of Florence under Eugene IV.

Finally, in our sixteenth century the errors of the Lutherans were condemned by the Council of Trent and confirmed by Pius IV. Now let them find just one example from antiquity, by which they can prove that some new error arose in the Church as a true error and still was not condemned by the Pontiff, but by the Emperor or by some secular Prince. Or let them say, if they can, who ever dared to reject a decision of the Councils approved by the Roman Présider and was not immediately condemned as a heretic by the Catholic Church.

CHAPTER VII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF PONTIFFS AND EMPERORS

In the fourth place there are the testimonies of the ancient Pontiffs and Emperors, that is, the authors of both Legal Systems. Damasus in letter 3 to Stephen, Innocent I in his letters to the Councils of Carthage and Mileum, which are found as 91 and 93 among Augustine's letters, Leo I in letter 84 to Anastasius and 59 to the Bishops of the province of Vienne, Gelasius in a letter to the Bishop of Dardania, Gregory in book 4, letter 52 to the Bishops of Gaul teach that the more serious cases, especially in matters of faith, pertain to the judgment of the Apostolic See; and to prove this Julius cites in letter 2 the decree of the Council of Nicaea.

The Emperors were of the same mind. At the time of the Emperor Aurelian, when there was a question between Catholics and the heretic Paul of Samosata, about the possession of a Church, the Emperor, although a Gentile, responded and ordered that the Church be given to the one whom the Italian Bishops and the Bishop of Rome would designate; thus, he had learned on his own that the Roman Bishop is the supreme judge of Christian affairs. This is what Eusebius writes in book 7, chapter 26 of his History.

Constantine, according to Eusebius in book 3, chapter 12 of his life of Constantine, at the Council of Nicaea did not sit in the first place, which the Bishops had said he should take. In this way he indicated sufficiently that he was not presiding over the Council. Then, when the Council was concluded he wrote a letter to all the Churches, which Eusebius preserves totally in the same place, and at the end of it he says: *Since that is the way things are, with a free mind you should embrace this decree of the Council as a gift of God, and a command really coming from heaven. For whatever is decreed in the holy Councils of Bishops, all of it must be attributed to the divine will.*

On this same matter St. Ambrose says in letter 32: *Constantine did not proclaim any laws before the Council, but he gave free judgment to the priests.* About this St. Augustine also says in letter 162, chapter 7, that since the Donatists wanted their cause to be judged by him, he referred them to their own proper judge, that is, Pope Miltiades, and when they appealed from the judgment of the Pontiff to the Emperor himself: *He gave,* Augustine said, *another Arelatian judgment* (that is, of the other Bishops), *not because it was now necessary, but acceding to their perversities.* For the Christian Emperor did not want to give in to their turbulent and fallacious complaints so that he would be passing judgment on the decision of the Bishops who reside in Rome.

The Emperor Gratian says this in his letter to the Bishop of Aquileia, which was read at the Council of Aquileia: *Doubtful controversies cannot be examined more correctly* (and perhaps resolved) *than by constituting the Priests as the interpreters of the present dispute, namely, that from whom the established doctrines come, by the same the disagreement over conflicting positions should be resolved.* Ambrose interpreted these words to the Council in this way: *Behold,* he said, *what a Christian Emperor decrees. He did not want to injure the Priests, so he established the Bishops themselves as the interpreters.*

Theodosius II in a letter to the Council of Ephesus, which Nicholas I also cites in his letter to Emperor Michael, said: *Candidianus, a distinguished member of active domestics, has been deputed to travel to your holy Synod, but in no way to get involved in things that must be done concerning religious dogmas. For it is not allowed that someone, who does not belong to the order of holy Bishops, should immerse himself in ecclesiastical affairs.*

The Emperor Martianus on the holy Trinity and the Catholic Faith said: *He does injury to the Most Reverend Synod, who, having already been judged, tries to dispute and reverse the decision.*

Valentinian the Elder, as Sozomenus recounts in book 6, chapter 7 of his History, having been asked to permit a Synod to be held in order to clarify some dogmas of the faith, responded thus: *It is not allowed for me, since I am a member of the people, to search into such things inquisitively; the Priests, to whom these things have been entrusted, may gather together in assembly wherever they wish.*

The Emperor Basil at the eighth Council (acts 10) said this: *But concerning us lay people, both those who have dignities and those who have absolute power, what more can I say than that in no way are you allowed to speak out on ecclesiastical matters; and you cannot resist internally the integrity of the Church and oppose a universal Synod. For to examine and question such things pertains to the Patriarchs, Pontiffs and Priests who have received the office of governing, who sanctify, who have the power of binding and loosing, who have received the ecclesiastical keys; it does not pertain to us who must be fed, who must be made holy, who must be bound, or need to be released from a bond.* In the same place the same Emperor says that other Emperors, who were his predecessors—Constantine, Theodosius, Martianus, and others—never undersigned the document of the Councils, except after all the Bishops.

Finally, concerning Theodoric, King of the Goths, even though he was an Arian, at the fourth Roman Synod under Pope Symmachus, we read the following: *To these things the Most Serene King, at the urging of God, responds in this way: that it belongs to the choice of the Synod to prescribe what must be done in such an important matter, and that nothing else belongs to himself but to show reverence for the ecclesiastical decisions.*

CHAPTER VIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS

In the fifth place, it is proved from the testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers. Irenaeus in book 3 teaches that controversies cannot be resolved by Scripture alone, because they are explained differently by the heretics, and then in chapter 3 he says that controversies must be resolved by the doctrine of the Roman Church. *With this Church, because of its more powerful origin, it is necessary that every Church agree, that is those who are faithful everywhere; in this Church is preserved by those who are everywhere the tradition which is from the Apostles.*

Athanasius in a letter on leading a solitary life, while speaking about the Emperor Constantius, an Arian, who usurped for himself some decision in the Councils, said the following: *When has such a thing ever been heard? When did the judgment of the Church receive its authority from the Emperor? Or when was this ever recognized for a judgment? Formerly there were several Synods: many decisions of the Church were made. But the Fathers did not try to persuade the Prince to do such a thing, nor did the Prince involve himself in ecclesiastical matters.* And further on he said: *Who, seeing him make himself the Prince of Bishops in making decrees and presiding over ecclesiastical judgments, would not rightly say that this is the very abomination of desolation, which was predicted by Daniel?* Basil in letter 52 to Athanas says: that it seems good to him that when the Synod there could not be concluded, they should write to the Roman Pontiff so that he, on his own authority, might send some men to the East in order to make void the acts of the Council of Ariminum.

Gregory Nazianzen in an Oration, in which he excuses himself because he had absented himself for a long time from his ecclesiastical function, said the following: *You sheep do not feed the Shepherds, nor are you raised above their limits; for, it is enough for you, if you are rightly nourished. Do not judge the judges and do not make laws for the legislators, etc.* But how is it that he does not judge the judges, and pasture the shepherds, who presumes to judge the decision of a Council or of the Sovereign Pontiff? And lest you think the Presiders have been exempted by Gregoiy, he in his Oration to his citizens struck with fear, and to the irate Préside r said: *When the Préside r speaks, do you accept his free voice? And that the law of Christ subjected you to my power and to my tribunal? For, we also command; and I add, with a greater and more perfect command; therefore accept a freer voice, for I know that you are the sheep of my flock, etc.* Chrysostom in his homily on John 21 says that Peter was established by Christ as the teacher of the whole world. Cyril says in the Thesaurus, as St. Thomas quotes it in his *Opusculum* 1 against the error of the Greeks: *We must cling to our head, the Roman Pontiff, for it is necessary to accept from him what we must believe and hold.* See also Damascene in his sermons 1 and 2 in favor of images.

Of the Latin authors, Tertullian in *The Prescription against Heretics* deduces beautifully what we want. First of all, he teaches that we should dispute with heretics from the Scriptures, because, since the possession and true understanding of the Scriptures

belongs to the Catholic Church, first it must be established what the true doctrine of the Church is, and then from that the Scriptures must be understood. But what the true doctrine of the Church is, cannot be more safely sought than in the Apostolic Churches, of which the principal one is the Roman. For, God gave the doctrine of truth to Christ, Christ to the Apostles, the Apostles to their successors. This is a summary of what he says. Cyprian says in book 1, letter 3: *For heresies have appeared from no other source, or schisms been born, except from the fact that there was no obedience to the priest of God.* For, before a definition of the Pontiffs, it is permitted to take either side in doubtful matters without falling into heresy; but after a definition, those who do not obey become heretics.

Ambrose in letter 32 to the Emperor Valentinianus, who, having been corrupted by the Arians, wanted to pass judgment on matters of Faith, said: *But certainly if we consider either the list of the divine Scriptures, or the old times, who will deny in the cause of the Faith, I say in the cause of the Faith, that the Bishops are wont to judge Christian Emperors, and that Emperors do not judge Bishops? You will be, with the help of God, also more advanced in the maturity of old age, and then you will think about this, what kind of Bishop he is who makes the rights of priests subject to lay people. Your Father, a man of mature age, used to say: It is not in my power to judge between Bishops: now your Clemency says, I must judge.* And after that he said: *If there must be a consultation about the Faith, that discussion must be done by priests, as was done under Constantine, the Prince of happy memory, who did not pass any laws on his own, but he left the free judgment to the priests. This also took place under Constantius, Emperor of happy memory, the heir of paternal dignity. But what began well, ended in a different way. For, the Bishops first had written down the genuine Faith, but since some individuals inside the palace want to pass judgment on the Faith, they did it, in order that with their own qualifications the decisions of the Bishops might be changed.* The reader should note these last words: the lay persons in the house of the Prince, since they want to judge the decision of the Bishops, deserve to fall into error.

Jerome in a letter to Damasus on the word "hypostasis" said: *Decide, if you please, I beseech you; I am not afraid to affirm three hypostases, if you so order.* And after that he said: *I implore your beatitude through the crucified one, the salvation of the world, through the* ὁμοουσιον *of the Trinity, that through your letters the authority be given to me either of being silent about or speaking about the hypostases.* He asks for the same thing in the following letter. And please note that Jerome was by far more learned than Damasus, as is clear from the many questions about the Scriptures that Jerome explained for Damasus; but when the concern was about a judgment of Faith, that something should be defined, Jerome leaves the whole judgment to Pope Damasus. Sulpicius in book 2 of his History recounts that St. Martin at one time said to the Emperor Maximus: It is a new and unheard of sin that a secular judge should pass judgment on a cause of the Church.

Augustine in book 1, chapter 33 against Crescon said: *Whoever fears to be mistaken by the obscurity of this question, on this matter let him consult the Church, which the holy Scripture demonstrates without any ambiguity.* And in his letter 106 to Paulinus, while speaking about the letters of Innocent in which it is clearly stated that the judgment about

matters of Faith pertains to the Apostolic See, he says this: *He answered us in all things, in the right way and as is necessary for the occupant of the Apostolic See.* And in his book against the Fundamental Principle, in chapter 5 he said: *For my part, I should not believe the gospel except as moved by the authority of the Catholic Church.*

Calvin says that Augustine is speaking about a private conviction of the faithful, whereby some are converted to the faith, so that the meaning is: *I would not believe the Gospel,* that is, *I would not now be a Christian, unless Christians had moved me with their persuasions.* But this answer is off the mark; for, first of all, Augustine is speaking about the present when he says: *Unless the authority of the Church were moving me.* Then shortly thereafter he said: *It was at the command of Catholics that I believed the Gospel, and in obedience to them I will not believe you at all.* There he attributes to the Church not persuasion, but command. And after that, while speaking about the Acts of the Apostles, he said: *It is necessary for me to believe in this book, if I believe in the Gospel, since Catholic authority commends both Scriptures alike to me.* The same author in the preface of his book on Christian Doctrine, as if he saw in advance that private spirit, which refused to have a teacher, said: *We should beware of most proud and most dangerous temptations of this kind and think rather of the centurion Cornelius', although an angel announced to him that his prayers had been heard and his alms recognized, he was sent to Peter for instruction. And certainly the Apostle did not send the eunuch who did not understand what he read in the prophet Isaiah to an angel, nor was what he did not understand either explained to him by an angel or revealed to him divinely in his mind without human ministration, etc.*

Prosper in his book against the Collations (at the end) proves that the Pelagians were truly heretics because they had been condemned by the Roman Bishops, Innocent, Zosimus, Boniface, Celestine. St. Vincent of Lérins in chapter 2 of his Commonitory said: *But here some one perhaps will ask, Since the canon of Scripture is complete, and sufficient of itself for everything, and more than sufficient, what need is there to join with it the authority of the Church's interpretation? For this reason—because, owing to the depth of Holy Scripture they do not accept it in one and the same sense, but one understands its words in one way, another in another; so that it seems to be capable of as many interpretations as there are interpreters... Therefore, it is very necessary, on account of so great intricacies of such various error, that the rule for the right understanding of the prophets and Apostles should be framed in accordance with the standard of Ecclesiastical and Catholic interpretation.* In the same place he clearly shows that the decrees of the Councils, the consent of the Fathers, and similar points are the norm for the Catholic meaning.

Gregoiy in book 6, letter 25 said the following: *It is known to us that our pious lords love discipline, observe orders, venerate the canons, and refrain from mixing themselves up in the causes of priests.* Anselm, in chapter 1 of his book on the Incarnation of the Word, addresses the Roman Pontiff Urban in the following way: *Since divine providence has chosen Your Holiness, and has committed to you the office of protecting Christian life and Faith and of ruling his Church, then one does not rightly refer to anyone else, if something contrary to the Catholic Faith arises in the Church so that it may be corrected*

by his authority.

Bernard wrote in letter 190 to Pope Innocent II: *It is necessary that all dangers and scandals occurring in the kingdom of God be referred to your Apostolate, and especially things that concern the Faith. For, I think it is fitting that the injuries to the Faith should be corrected there especially where the Faith cannot sense any defect.* And after that he said: *It is time, beloved Father, for you to acknowledge your dominion, prove your zeal, honor your ministry. In it clearly you are fulfilling the role of Peter, whose chair you occupy, if you strengthen with your admonition hearts that are wavering in the Faith, if with your authority you suppress corrupters of the Faith.* And in letter 189 he wrote: *As I was saying, his writings are enough to accuse him, and that is not my responsibility but that of the Bishops, whose ministry it is to pass judgment on dogmatic matters.*

CHAPTER IX

THE SAME POINT IF PROVED FROM REASON

It is proved finally by reason. God was not ignorant of the fact that many difficulties would arise in the Church concerning the Faith. Therefore he had to provide a judge for the Church. But that judge cannot be Scripture, nor a private revealing spirit, nor a secular prince; therefore it had to be an ecclesiastical official, either alone or certainly with a council and the consent of his fellow Bishops. And it is not, nor could it be imagined anything else, to which it seems this judgment could pertain. And first of all, it is clear that Scripture is not the judge, because it is subject to various meanings, nor can it say which interpretation is true. Moreover, in every well-founded and ordered Republic, the law and the judges are distinct things. For, the law says what must be done, and the judge interprets the law, and he directs men according to it. Finally, there is a question about the interpretation of Scripture, since it cannot interpret itself.

But, they say, from a comparison of the various places the true meaning can be derived by anyone skilled in languages. But what is to be done, if many are skilled in languages, and they confer on the same texts among themselves, and nevertheless they are still not able to agree. Who then will be the judge? Certainly many Lutherans and many Zwinglians were skilled in languages, and they studied the Scriptures together with great effort, and nevertheless in the explanation of the sentence, *This is my Body,* they were never able to agree. But the Zwinglians, a Lutheran will say, are blind, and therefore it is not surprising that they do not understand the very clear words of the Lord. But what happens, if a Zwinglian says that the Lutherans are blind—who will be the judge?

It is easily demonstrated that a revealing spirit cannot be the judge for each private individual. Since the spirit, which is in you, is neither seen nor heard by me, then a judge should be seen and heard by both litigating parties; for the contending parties are of such a nature, that is, both are bodily men. For, if we were spirits, perhaps the judgment of a spirit would suffice. Furthermore, in a temporal Republic all have a true natural light of reason, according to which the law is established, and that suffices to explain it, and still, the private interpretation of the law is never handed over to the private judgment of each person. For, if that were permitted, the Republic could not exist for very long. Therefore how much less should the interpretation of Scripture be turned over to the judgment of each person, since all do not have that true supernatural light, by which Scripture was formed and which is necessary in order to understand it correctly.

Moreover, a judge must have effective authority, otherwise his judgment will mean nothing; but private individuals do not have such authority. Also many are so crude and ignorant, as they themselves admit, that they could in no way pass judgment on questions of faith, but still they also can be saved; therefore it is not necessary for all to judge.

Finally, if the private revealing spirit were judge, the way to convert heretics would be precluded, and no controversies could ever be brought to an end. For, there is no heretic who does not claim to have the spirit, and who does not place his spirit before the spirit of others. And as in 2 Chron. 18, when Micaiah, a prophet of the Lord, said that he

was speaking in the name of the Lord, but the false prophets were moved by a lying spirit, the false prophet Zedekiah said to him: *Which way did the Spirit of the Lord go from me to speak to you?* (v. 23). So if a Catholic would say "the Spirit has revealed this to me," the heretic would respond, "Which way did the Spirit, etc. "

It will now be proved that a secular Prince is not the judge. For nothing can act beyond the power of its own causes. But the causes involved in secular ruling are human and natural. For, the efficient cause is the choice of the people, while the end is the peace and temporal tranquility of the Republic; therefore the Prince as such does not have power or authority, except what is human; the people can give this to him and it is required in order to keep the peace. A sign of this is the fact that even without the Church there are true Kings, and temporal Princes; and without them there can be the true Church, as in the city of Rome during the first three centuries.

There is not obstacle to this in what is said in Rom. 13:1-2: *There is not authority except from God... and he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed.* For, the Apostle does not want to say that kingly power is from God immediately, but in a mediated way, because God placed the natural instinct in men to constitute a King for themselves. In the same way, human laws can be said to be from God, because they are the result of natural reason, which God implanted in the human mind when he created him. But the ecclesiastical governing power has divine and supernatural causes; for, the efficient cause immediately is God, since the Pontiff does not have his authority from the Church, but from Christ, who said to him: *Feed my sheep* (John 21:17). And also: *I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven* (Matt. 16:19). But the final cause is eternal beatitude.

Therefore outside the Church a true Pontiff is not found, nor true Priests, nor without them can there be a Church. Hence Nazianzen in his sermon to the citizens struck with fear, Chrysostom in homily 4 on Isaiah, and Ambrose in chapter 2 of his book on the dignity of the priesthood say that a Bishop is as much greater than a king, as the spirit is to flesh, as the sky to the earth, as gold to lead. And for this reason also the pontificate and the priesthood pertain per se to the Church; but temporal rule pertains to her only accidentally. Therefore, since to define matters of Faith, and to interpret the divine Scriptures is an ecclesiastical and spiritual activity, for certain it does not pertain to the temporal Prince, but to the spiritual and ecclesiastical order.

CHAPTER X

THE OBJECTIONS ARE ANSWERED

First, they raise an objection from Isa. 54:13: *All your sons shall be taught by the Lord.* I respond: Isaiah is not talking about a private spirit of revelation, but either he is speaking about the teaching of the Gospel, which God himself, that is, Christ preached and taught, as Cyril says in explaining this text, so that the meaning is: *I will not teach the Christian people through prophets, but by myself,* according to what is said in Heb. 1, *In many and various ways God spoke, etc.* Or (which is a more subtle and fuller explanation) he is speaking about the grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby man is moved interiorly by God, and is moved gently to believe and to love, as St. Augustine explains it in his book on the grace of Christ, chapters 12, 13 and 14. Therefore, the meaning is not that all Christians will understand, by a divine revelation, all the secrets of the Scriptures, but will be in the future of such a nature that they not only hear the teacher exteriorly explaining the word of God, but also hear interiorly God teaching them and urging them to do what they hear. When there is a sermon, all hear it and understand what is said, but one person believes and another does not believe; one is converted from sin to repentance, another is not converted; the former are said to be taught by God, while the latter are not. In this sense the Lord presents testimony from this text in what he said in John 6:45: *It is written in the prophets: And they shall all be taught by God. Every one who has heard and learned from the Father comes to me.* And the Apostle in 1 Thess. 4:9: *Concerning love of the brethren you have no need to have anyone write to you, for you yourselves have been taught by God to love one another.*

The second argument is in Jer. 31:33-34: *I will put my law within them, and I will write it upon their hearts... and no longer shall each man teach his neighbor and teach his brother saying: Know the Lord, for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest.*

I respond with St. Augustine in chapter 33 in his book *On Spirit and the Letter* that with those words, *I will put my law, etc.,* the grace of the New Testament is meant here, that is, Faith operating through charity, which God pours into our hearts, so that we not only know, but also carry out the divine commands; but with the words, *No longer shall each man teach, etc.,* the reward of Faith is meant, that is, beatitude, in which all the elect shall see God face to face.

If, however, someone contends that also those last words are to be understood about the present time, the response can be made: here the prophet is not talking about mysteries hidden in the Scriptures, but about the knowledge of the one God. For, since during the time of the Old Testament not only the Gentiles adored false gods, but also often the people of God were converted to idols and to foreign gods. Jeremiah foretold the future—that in the time of the New Testament all men will know the one God, which certainly now we see fulfilled. For, the Gentiles have been converted to the Faith, and also the Jews and Turks, although they are impious, still they worship the one God.

The third argument is Matt. 23:8: *But you are not to be called rabbi, for you have*

one teacher. Therefore we should be content with an internal teacher alone. I respond: the Lord does not forbid the name and office of teacher, but the ambition and affectation of that honor. For, in 2 Tim. the Apostle calls himself the doctor and teacher of the Gentiles. Moreover, in that chapter 23 the Lord reprehends the scribes and Pharisees, because they love the first places, and to be greeted by men with the salutation of "Rabbi." And in the same place he says: *And call no man your father on earth,* but it is certain that the name or function of father is not being forbidden, but too much affection towards parents.

The fourth argument is in John 5:34: *The testimony which I receive is not from man,* and therefore the word of God does not receive testimony from the word of man. But the Pontiff and a Council are men. Therefore the Scriptures do not need their testimony, but of themselves are sufficient to resolve all controversies.

I respond: Christ does not need for himself the testimony of men, because he has greater testimonies, but he does use the testimonies of men for the sake of others. John 1:7, *He came for testimony, to bear witness to the light.* And John 15:27, *You also are witnesses, because you have been with me from the beginning.* Acts 1:8, *You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea.* Finally, why are the martyrs called "martyrs," unless it is because they were witnesses to Christ? Therefore, since the Lord said: *You sent to John, and he has bom witness to the truth* (John 5:33); *not that the testimony which I receive is from man, but I say this that you may be saved:* so the meaning here is this: *I am giving you the testimony of John, which you have asked for, not because I need it for myself, but because it is useful for you so that you may believe more easily.* In the same way, Scripture does not need the testimony of men for itself; for, whether it is understood or not understood, in itself it is true. However, for our sake it needs the testimony of the Church, because otherwise we are not certain which books truly are sacred and divine, and what their true and genuine meaning is.

The fifth argument is John 7:17: *If any man's will is to do his will,* that is, of the one who sent me, *he shall know whether the teaching is from God.* Therefore, beside the spirit of the love of God no other teaching is required in order to understand the Scriptures.

I respond: the Lord does not say that in order to show that all good men per se can understand all the passages of the Scriptures, but in order to teach that some men lack certain impediments, because of which some neither by themselves nor with the help of others can understand the truth of the Faith. For, the passionate longing for glory, and money and such things blinds the eyes. Hence John 5:44 says: *How can you believe, who receive glory from one another?* And Luke 16:14: *The Pharisees, who were lovers of money, heard all this, and they scoffed at him.*

The sixth argument is in John 10:27: *My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me.* Therefore they do not need any other teacher. I respond: the Lord is speaking about the predestined, as Augustine explains this, who before their death completely hear the call of God, and they follow it perseveringly until death; and he is not speaking here about the difficulties of the Scriptures. But even if he were speaking about the understanding of the Scriptures, we would say that Christ speaks to his sheep in many ways—through Scripture, through internal inspiration, and openly through the mouth of his Vicars, about whom he said in Luke 10:16: *He who hears you hears me.* For when the

Lord says, *My sheep hear my voice,* he is not excluding his Vicars, but his enemies. Thus he says in the same place: *A stranger they will notfollow* (John 10:5); and, *They do not know the voice ofstrangers.*

The seventh argument is in Acts 17:1 Off. The Beroeans examined the Scriptures to see whether they agreed with what Paul preached. For if it was permitted for those men, who were doubtless lay persons, to scrutinize the words of Paul, why is it not permitted for us to examine the words of the Pope and of the Councils? I respond: even though Paul was an Apostle, and could not preach false doctrine, nevertheless in the beginning the Beroeans were not certain and they were bound to believe immediately, unless they first saw miracles or other probable reasons for believing. Therefore, when Paul proved to them that Christ was the fulfillment of the oracles of the Prophets, rightly did they search the Scriptures to see whether that was true. But Christians, who are certain that the Church cannot err in explaining the doctrine of the Faith, are bound to receive it and not to have doubts about whether or not it is true.

I add also that, although a heretic sins by doubting the authority of the Church, in which he was re-born through Baptism, the condition of the heretic, who at one time professed the Faith, is not the same as that of the Jew or pagan who never was a Christian; nevertheless, given this doubt and this sin, he does not act badly by searching and examining to see whether the places of Scripture and of the Fathers quoted by the Council of Trent really are convincing, provided that he does it with the intention of finding the truth, and not of making false accusations. Indeed, he ought to accept the teaching of the Church without testing it; however, it is better that by examining it he i being prepared for the truth, than by neglecting it he remain in his darkness.

The eighth argument is in Rom. 12:6f.: *Having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us use them: if prophecy, in proportion to ourfaith; if service, in our serving, etc.* Here the Apostle is teaching that the gift of prophecy, that is, interpretation of the Scriptures, is had according to reason, in Greek it is the ἀναλογία of Faith, that is, according to the measure and proportion of Faith; therefore the interpretation of Scripture should not be sought from the Pope or a Council, but from the one who abounds more in Faith, whoever he may be.

I respond: in the first place, the consequence could be denied; for, the Pope and a Council abound in faith more than any private person, since the Pope when he teaches *ex cathedra,* and a Council cannot err in Faith, but every private person can err. Secondly, it could be said that prophecy in this text is not taken for the interpretation of Scripture, but really for the gift of foretelling the future, as it is explained by Ambrose, Theodoretus, Theophylact, Thomas and others concerning this text, and also Chrysostom on 1 Cor. 12. But in the third place I say that however the word "prophecy" is taken, whether for the gift of predicting future events, or for the gift of interpreting, from this passage nothing can be concluded against us. For, that expression "in proportion to our faith" is not joined with the word "having," but with the understood expression "let us administer." For, the Apostle is explaining the use of charismatic gifts, and he teaches that prophecy should be administered in proportion to the Faith, so that no one prophesies something against the Faith, as the false prophets were doing, nor should a prophet interpret the Scriptures in a

sense contrary to Catholic Faith, as the heretics often do.

The ninth argument is in 1 Cor. 2:15: *The spiritual man judges all things, but is himself to be judged by no one.* Therefore the interpretation of Scripture pertains to spiritual men, not to the Pope, or to Councils. I respond: we do not deny that there were and are in the Church spiritual and perfect men, who correctly interpret the Scriptures, who see into the future and who read the secrets of hearts. But we deny that a definitive judgment of the controversies over the Faith pertain to them, and we do this for two reasons. First, because we are not certain with the certainty of Faith, who these spiritual men are, as we are certain that the Pope and a Council are spiritual, namely, that they are guided by the Holy Spirit. Second, because we know also that very spiritual men are not always enlightened, and at times are ignorant of certain things, as is clear about Elisha who had a double portion of the spirit of Elijah, and nevertheless he says in 2 Kings 4:27, *the Lord has hidden itfi-om me, and has not told me.*

You will say: therefore what is the meaning of the phrase "he will judge all things"? I say that it means all things, both spiritual and temporal, both heavenly and earthly. For, he had said that earthly men do not perceive the things of God, but can judge only about earthly things. Now he says that spiritual men judge all things, that is, earthly and divine, but it does not follow that he can judge all divine things. For, who will deny that many of the ancient Fathers had an excellent gift of interpreting, and were spiritual, and nevertheless it is certain that some of the principal ones in certain matter erred in no small way?

The tenth argument is in 1 Cor. 12:11. While speaking about the gift of interpretation, and similar graces, the Apostle said: *All these things are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills.* Therefore this gift is not tied to a Council or to a Pope, but is freely given by God to whom he wishes. And this is confirmed by examples, because often, during the time of Priests and Pontiffs in the past, God raised up prophets from the people; for, Amos was a shepherd of sheep, and still he was made a prophet, and the woman Debora prophesied.

I respond that the Apostle is speaking about particular men, and that he wants to say that the gift of interpreting is not given passim to all men. And it does not follow from this that the gift of interpretation is not present in a Council or a Pontiff teaching *ex cathedra.* For the nature of a Council or Pontiff is one thing, and that of private individuals is something else.

In confirmation of the above I say that the privileges of a few do not make a general law. But if they contend it is given to all, because it was given to Amos and Deborah, they can also conclude that the gift of speaking is given to all beasts of burden, because it was given to Balaam's ass. Moreover, it is one thing to speak about new revelations, and something else the explanation of a doctrine already accepted. For, new revelations are not attached to Pontiffs, not now, not in the Old Testament. For, in the Old Testament Isaiah, Jeremiah and others prophesied, but not Aaron and his successors; and in the New Testament Agabus prophesied, and the daughters of Philip, but the Pontiffs Linus, and Clement and others did not prophesy. But the explanation of the received doctrine and the decision about dogmas always belonged to the Pontiffs, as we have shown above.

The eleventh argument is in 1 Thess. 5:21: *Test everything, holdfast what is good,* and 1 John 4:1, *Do not believe every spirit, but test the spirits to see whether they are of God.* Therefore the decision of a Council and a Pope must be tested and examined; for, Paul and John make no exceptions. Also they gather from these texts that the books of heretics are unjustly prohibited, since Paul says "test everything."

I respond with two answers. First, when Paul and John say, *test everything,* or *test the spirits,* they do not want to say that everyone in the Church should do that, but that they should do it to whom it pertains. Just as if it is written to some Academy that they should examine a book, it does not mean that the book to be examined should be given to all the members of the Academy, but only to the teachers of the faculty who are experts in that field. Second, in both texts they are concerned about doubtful teaching, because only that needs to be tested. But the teaching of forbidden books is not doubtful, for it is obviously bad since it has already been examined and condemned. And the doctrine of the Councils is not doubtful, but clearly good. And so the Apostle Paul in Acts 15, when he sent the decree of the Council of Jerusalem to the Churches, did not say "test it," but he ordered the decree to be observed.

The twelfth argument is in 1 John 2:27: *You have no need that any one should teach you, as his anointing teaches you about everything.* I respond: John is not talking absolutely about the knowledge of divine things, as if those who have received the Holy Spirit do not need a teacher for any thing. For, if that were the case, why did John write this letter, and warn and instruct those whom the anointing was teaching all things? And for what purpose did God place pastors and doctors in the Church? Therefore, he is speaking only about those teachings that they had already received from the Apostles, and with the help of the Holy Spirit they had learned and believed. And he admonished them to persevere in the Faith, and not to listen to the pseudo-apostles who were teaching contrary things. It is as if a Catholic would write to other Catholics, who are being attacked and upset by heretics, and say: it is not necessary for you that some Lutheran or Calvinist should teach you the doctrine of Christ, for you have already learned everything you need to know, and you are bound by the preaching of the Church to the anointing of the Holy Spirit. The preceding and following words teach that this is the meaning. Thus he says: *I write to you, not because you do not know the truth, but because you know it... and let what you heard from the beginning abide in you... I write this to you about those who would deceive you, etc.* (2:21-26). But in what follows he says: *Just as I taught you, abide in him... so that when he appears we may have confidence and not shrink from him in shame at his coming* (2:27-28).

The thirteenth argument. The Apostle writes in Eph. 2:19-20: *You are fellow citizens with the saints and members of the household of God, built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* But if the understanding of Scripture depended on the Pope and the Councils, our foundation would be upon the Pope and the Councils more than it is on the Apostles and Prophets.

I respond to this argument which Calvin often repeats and insists on: we do not deny, and in fact we defend against those who deny it, that the word of God proclaimed by the Apostles and Prophets is the first foundation of our Faith; for, we believe whatever we

believe, because God has revealed it through the Apostles and Prophets. But we add, in addition to this first foundation, that another secondary foundation is required, that is, the attestation of the Church. For, we do not know for certain what God has revealed, unless it is from the testimony of the Church. And on that account, just as we read that Christ is the fundamental stone, and the first foundation of the Church, so also we read in Matt.l6:18 about Peter, *on this rock I will build by Church.* Therefore, our Faith adheres to Christ as the first truth revealing mysteries, as the primary foundation; it adheres also to Peter, that is, the Pontiff proposing and explaining these mysteries, as the secondary foundation.

The fourteenth argument. If the Pontiff passes judgment on the Scriptures, it follows that the Pontiff or a Council is above Scripture; and if the meaning of Scripture is not authentic without the Pontiff or a Council, it follows that the word of God receives its strength and firmness from the word of men.

I respond: this argument, which is often made by the heretics, is involved totally in an equivocation. For, that the Church judges the Scriptures can be understood in two ways: in one way, that she judges whether what the Scriptures teach is true or false. In the other way, once given as a certain foundation that the words of Scripture are true, she judges what the true interpretation of them is. Actually, if the Church were to judge in the first way, she would truly be over the Scripture, but we do not say this, although the heretics falsely claim that we do say that; they also often proclaim that we place Scripture under the feet of the Pope. But in the second way in which we do say that the Church or the Pontiff passes judgment concerning the Scriptures, it is not that the Church is over the Scriptures, but over the judgments of private persons. For the Church does not judge concerning the truth of Scripture, but its understanding by you, and by me and by others. And from this the word of God does not derive some kind of strength, but our understanding. For, the Scripture is not more true, or more certain, because it is thus explained by the Church, but my thought is more true, when it is confirmed by the Church.

The fifteenth argument. If our Faith depends on the judgment of the Church, then it depends on a human word; therefore it is resting on a very weak foundation. Furthermore, Scripture was made by the Spirit of God; therefore it must be understood by the Spirit of God, not by the Church.

I respond that the word of the Church (i.e., of a Council or of a Pope teaching er *cathedra)* is not completely the word of a man, that is, a word subject to error, but in some way it is the word of God, that is, uttered with the assistance and guidance of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, I say that it is the heretics who are relying on a bent reed. For, it should be known that a proposition of the Faith is arrived at by the following syllogism: Whatever God revealed in the Scriptures is true. But God revealed this in the Scriptures. Therefore this is true. Of the propositions of this syllogisms, the first one is certain for everyone; the second one among Catholics is also very firm, for it is based on the testimony of the Church, of a Council, or of a Pontiff, concerning whom we have in the Scriptures clear promises that they cannot err. Acts 15:28: *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and io us.* And Luke 22:32:*1 have prayed for you that your faith may not fail.* But among the

heretics it relies only on conjecture, or the judgment of one's own mind, which often seems to be good, but is bad; and since the conclusion follows the weaker part, it is necessary that the whole Faith of heretics is conjectural and uncertain.

The sixteenth argument. When Augustine and the other Fathers explain the Scriptures, they do not make use of an official power of interpreting, but they permit their explanations to be judged by others.

I respond: it is one thing to interpret the law like a teacher, but something else to do it like a judge. To explain it like a teacher requires erudition, but to explain it like a judge requires authority. For, a teacher does not propose his opinion as something to be followed necessarily, but only insofar as reason indicates; but a judge proposes it to be followed necessarily. In one way we accept the glosses of Bartholi and Baldi, in another way the declaration of a King. Therefore Augustine and the other Fathers, in their Commentaries, perform the office of teachers; but the Councils and Pontiffs perform the office of a judge commissioned by God himself.

The seventeenth argument. *Augustine contends that the Church should not place herself before Christ, because he always judges truly: but the ecclesiastical judges, as men, often fall into error.* These are Calvin's words in the preface to his Institutes; from this he concludes that Prelates are not judges of the controversies.

I respond, first of all, that the place cited by Calvin is wrong, for in the margin he writes chapter 2 against Cresconius; but against Cresconius there are four books, but in no chapter 2 of those books are those words found, but they are found in book 2, chapter 21, where Augustine speaks about questions of fact, not of right, in which ecclesiastical judges can be in error. For he teaches that often ecclesiastical judges are in error by the fact that they baptize those who approach the Sacrament with a false attitude, and nevertheless seem to approach it with a sincere will. And since Calvin seemed not to consider that place important, perhaps he did not note carefully the place. For, otherwise he is accustomed to be quite careful in quoting books, and also the chapters, except when the places contain a veiy clear explanation.

We will answer many other arguments, which seem to be pertinent here, when we treat the following points: whether the Church, or a Council or the Pope can err, and whose office it is to preside over Councils.

BOOK FOUR

On the unwritten word of God

CHAPTER I

ON THOSE WHO MAINLY HAVE DEFENDED OR OPPOSED THE UNWRITTEN TRADITIONS

Up to this point we have treated the subject of the written word of God, but now we will begin to discuss briefly the unwritten word of God. First of all we will take into consideration the works of those scholars who chiefly in this century have written about the Traditions, or certainly those whom we have read. For it was not possible for us to consult all of them.

Therefore those who wrote very well about this question are: Cardinal Hosius in 4 books against the Prolegomena of Brentius, likewise Peter a Soto in his defense against the same Brentius (par. 2, chapters 5 to 66), Melchior Cano in book 3 of his Theological Places, Martin Peresius at the beginning of his work on Tradition, Jodocus Tiletanus in his Apology against Kemnitius on the Council of Trent, Alphonse a Castro in book 1, chapter 5 of his work against the heretics, and Bishop Roffensis at the beginning of his work against the assertions of Luther; the Cologne Doctors in their examination of the Catechism Monhem., in censure 6 of the Dialogue; Peter Canisius in his Catechism on the precepts of the Church, and Gulielmus Lindanus in book 5 of his Panoply, John a Lovanio in his book on the invocation of the Saints (chapters 23-25), Felician Ninguarda in his defense of the Catholic Faith, Gaspar Cardileus Villalpandaeus in a book on Tradition.

Of the heretics, those who wrote especially against Tradition are: John Calvin in book 4, chapter 8 § 6-8 of his Institutes and chapter 10 § 18-20, and in his Antidote to session 4 of the Council of Trent; John Brentius in his Prolegomena against Peter a Soto; Martin Kemnitius in the book to which he gave the title, the principal heads of the Theology of the Jesuits; and at great length in his examination of the Council of Trent while treating the decree on Traditions which is found in session 4; and a certain Herman Hamelmannus, who recently published a huge volume against the Traditions, which he divided into three volumes of Prolegomena, each of which has many books.

CHAPTER II

WHAT TRADITION IS AND ITS VARIOUS FORMS

The word "Tradition" is general, and it signifies eveiy doctrine whether written or unwritten, which is communicated by one person to another. Exod. 17:14: *Write this as a memorial in a book and recite it in the ears of Joshua.* In Acts 6:14 the written Law of Moses is called "Tradition": *We have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place, and will change the Traditions, which Moses delivered to us.* But in 1 Cor. 11:23: *For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you;* Tradition is called a living doctrine proclaimed with the voice: 2 Thess. 2:15: *Hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter.*

Although the word "Tradition" is general, nevertheless this word has been accommodated by Theologians to signify only unwritten doctrine. Thus Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 2 said: *And it happened that they agreed neither with Scriptures nor with the Tradition.* Tertullian in chapter 4 of his book *De Corona* said: *If you insist upon having positive Scripture injunction, you will find none. Tradition will be held forth to you as the originator of them, etc.* Cyprian in book 2, chapter 3: *You know that we have been warned, so that in offering the chalice the Lord's Tradition should be observed, namely, that the chalice which is offered in memory of him, should be offered as wine mixed with water.* Kemnitius falsely explains this passage as a written Tradition; for, nowhere in the whole Gospel or in the letters of the Apostles is it written that a chalice of mixed wine, that is, wine and water is to be offered. In the same way almost all the ancients use the word "Tradition" for the unwritten doctrine; and that is the way we will use this word.

But what is called unwritten doctrine is not that which was never written, but which was not written by a first author; an example of this would be the Baptism of infants. The baptizing of infants is called an unwritten apostolic Tradition, because it is not found written in any apostolic book, although it has been written in the books of almost all of the old Fathers.

But there is a twofold division of the Traditions: one is taken for the authors of the Traditions, the other for the matter. The first is in the divine Traditions—Apostolic and Ecclesiastical. Those are called divine which were received from Christ teaching the Apostles, and are found nowhere in the divine Writings: such are the things that pertain to the matter and form of the Sacraments, for we have very little about these in the divine Writings, and nevertheless it is certain that the essence of the Sacraments could not have been determined except by Christ. For the Apostle in 1 Cor. 11:23, when speaking about the Sacrament of the Euchai^ said: *For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you.*

The Apostolic Traditions properly are said to be those which were established by the Apostles, but not without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and still they are not found to be written in their letters, such as fasting during Lent, the Ember Days, and many other things which will be mentioned later. However, customarily also the divine Traditions are said to be apostolic, and the apostolic are said to be divine. The divine Traditions are called apostolic, not because they were instituted by them, but because they were given to the Church first by them, and because they had received them directly from Christ. And the

apostolic are said to be divine, not because God immediately instituted them, but because the Apostles did not establish them without the Spirit of God. In this way all the letters of the Apostles are said to be divine and apostolic writings, even though some things in them are divine precepts, and some things are really apostolic, as is clear from 1 Cor. 7:10: *I give charge, not I but the Lord,* and after that: *I say, not the Lord* (v. 12).

Ecclesiastical Traditions in the proper sense are said to be the ancient customs, started by Prelates or by the people, which gradually obtain the force of law by the tacit consent of the people. Divine Traditions have the same force as divine precepts, or the divine doctrine written in the Gospels; likewise, the unwritten apostolic Traditions have the same force as the written apostolic Traditions, as is declared in session 4 of the Council of Trent, and the reason for this is evident: for the word of God is not such, nor does it have any authority because it is written down on sheets of paper, but because it has been uttered by God, either immediately like the sermons of the Lord, or by the mediation of the Apostles, like the decree of the Apostles in Acts 15. The heretics do not deny this, or cannot deny it; for, as we shall explain later, it is not a question about how great the power is of the divine or apostolic Tradition, but whether a given Tradition is truly divine and apostolic.

But ecclesiastical Traditions have the same force as the decrees and written constitutions of the Church; for, also in a civil republic the force of approved customs is the same as that of the written laws, as is clear from distinction 1 of the canon *consuetudo,* and 1 *diuturna, ff.* on laws.

The second division of Traditions concerns the matter, in Traditions on Faith and Traditions on morals, which again are either perpetual or temporal, and either universal or particular, either necessary or free. A Tradition of faith is that Blessed Mary was always a virgin, that there are only four Gospels, etc. Tradition concerning morals is that a sign of the cross is made on the forehead, and on certain days there is fasting or the celebration of a feast, etc.

A perpetual Tradition is one that is instituted so that it will always be observed until the end of the world, as in the given examples. It is temporal if it is instituted for a certain time, like the observance of certain legal ceremonies, which were to be kept until the full promulgation of the Gospel, so that the Church could coalesce more easily from both Jews and Gentiles.

A universal Tradition is one that is to be observed by the whole Church, such as Easter, Pentecost, and the observance of similar great feasts, as St. Augustine teaches in letter 118. A particular Tradition is one that is handed on to only one or several Churches, such as fasting on Saturday during the time of Augustine, which Peter communicated to the Roman Church, and it was kept only by that Church and a few others, as Augustine says in letter 86 to Casulanus.

A necessary Tradition is one which is handed down in the form of a precept, like the celebration of Easter on the Sunday after the full moon of March. A free Tradition is one that is given in the form of a counsel, like the sprinkling of holy water and similar customs.

CHAPTER III

THE STATE OF THE QUESTION IS EXPLAINED, AND SOME LIES OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE UNCOVERED

Therefore the controversy between us and the heretics consists in two points. The first is that we say that the whole necessary doctrine, whether on Faith or morals, is not contained expressly in the Scriptures; and therefore that, besides the written word of God, also the unwritten word of God is required, that is, the divine and apostolic Traditions.

But they teach that everything necessary for faith and morals is contained in the Scriptures, and therefore that there is no need for any unwritten word. Luther in his commentaiy on Gal. 1 said: *No other doctrine should be handed on and heard in the Church than the pure word of God, that is, the Holy Scripture. The doctors or other students with their students, let them be anathema.* John Brentius in the prolegomena on Tradition said: *The Apostle clearly says that no Tradition contrary to and beside the testimonies of Scripture should be acknowledged as dogma necessary for salvation.* John Calvin in book 4 of his Institutes (c.8 § 8) said: *Therefore this is a firm axiom: nothing else is to be held as the word of God, which has recognition in the Church, except what is contained first of all in the Law and the Prophets, and then in the Apostolic writings.* Martin Kemnitius in his examination of session 4 of the Council of Trent often repeats that this is the state of the question: whether the Scriptures contain all the dogmas necessary for salvation—and that he affirms it and we deny it.

Secondly, we disagree with what they think, namely, that the Apostles instituted some things besides Scripture, which pertain to the rites and order of the Church, but which are not necessary and are not commanded, but free. But Kemnitius clearly teaches that nothing was handed on besides the Scripture necessarily pertaining to Faith and morals, when he treats the seven kinds of Traditions, and Calvin does the same in book 4 of the Institutes (ch. 10 § 20). But we acknowledge apostolic Traditions of all kinds, as we said above.

Thirdly, we disagree with what they think about the apostolic Traditions, if there were any, that they no longer exist; that is, that an apostolic Tradition cannot certainly be demonstrated. Thus Kemnitius said in the same place: *It can be proved with no certain and firm documents, which rites certainly were handed on by the Apostles, but cannot be proved from Scripture.* On the contrary, we say that definite rites and reasons are not lacking, whereby the apostolic Traditions are made known.

Now before I come to the proof, I wish to say a few things in the usual way about their contradictions and lies. Brentius and Kemnitius in the cited places clearly say that nothing can be made equal to the Holy Scriptures. Brentius says this: *Not content with the divinely commended and confirmed Scripture, they claim that the Apostles handed on many things to posterity by their words, which have no less authority than what was committed to writing.* And Kemnitius says: *It is an outstanding audacity to make anything equal to the majesty and authority of canonical Scripture.*

But the same authors confess that the Apostles did hand on something besides the

Scriptures. Brentius in the same place says this: *It should not and cannot be denied that both Christ did and said many things, and that the Apostles handed on and instituted many things, which are not included in their writings.* But Kemnitius says this: *It is certain from their writings that the Apostles ordained and handed on certain rites to the Churches, and it is probable that some other external things were handed on by the Apostles, which are not recorded in Scripture, etc.* Now if the authority of an Apostle prescribing orally is not less than what he commands in writing, certainly it is not audacious to make something unwritten equal to the written word. For we can, at a minimum, equate the ordination of an external rite handed on by the Apostles with a similar ordination committed to writing. For, they admit that the Apostles ordained something in both ways. Therefore, why do they complain that it is an outstanding audacity to equate something with the written word?

Now we will consider the lies. It is usual for Calvin, Brentius and Kemnitus often to repeat that we want every rite of the Church, without any distinctions, to be an apostolic Tradition. Thus Calvin says in book 4 of his Institutes (ch. 10 § 19): *The Roman professors want to maintain falsely that there is no ceremony of theirs which is not considered to be apostolic.* Next, it is common for them to act as if they alone defend the Scriptures and we defend only the Traditions, and as if we do not care whether the Traditions are in accordance with Scripture or opposed to Scripture. But that is not the case. For we take Scripture more seriously than they do, and we do not admit any Tradition contrary to Scripture.

But the lies of Kemnitius must be enumerated one by one. Therefore, in his examination of session 4 of the Council of Trent (pages 68-69), published in 1566, he says that we assert that God decreed that the doctrine of Christ and the Apostles should not be written in books, but handed on only by a living voice. And later, on page 183, he claims that the Apostles had a command to write. But both points are lies, and the truth is in the middle. For, no Catholic ever taught that God decreed that the New Testament should not be written; so let Kemnitius produce any author who said this. For thus the Evangelists and Apostles, in our opinion, would have sinned gravely by writing; but we say only, according to him, that the New Testament especially should be written in the heart, and we say it is not necessary that it be written in books.

It is also false that God commanded the Apostles to write. For, we read in Matt. 28:18-20 the command that they should preach the Gospel; but we read nowhere that they should write. Therefore God did not command that they should either write or not write. However, we do not deny that the Apostles wrote what they wrote according to the will and inspiration of God. For, it is one thing to do something at the suggestion and inspiration of God, but something else to do it as the result of a command. And in this way St. Augustine should be understood in book 1, the last chapter, of his *On the Harmony of the Gospels,* where he says this: *Whatever he wanted us to read about his deeds and words, this he commanded them to write as if it were with his own hands.* For he is speaking about an internal command, whereby Christ invisibly, as the Head moves the members, moves to various actions, and this command should be considered to be a suggestion and inspiration rather than a precept in the proper sense.

And there is no opposition to this in the fact that in the book of Revelation at times we read, *Write what you see:* for, John is commanded to write down certain secrete visions, not the doctrine of the Gospel, and the precepts of morals which we are considering.

Then at the end of his disputation on Tradition, page 420, Kemnitius says this: *Finally, this observation offers sufficient warning to the reader, namely, that the Pontiffs do not hesitate to refer many things to the Tradition of the Apostles, which were instituted and written by other authors much later, and this can be shown from the writings themselves of the Pontiffs, etc.* Then he proves this with eleven examples, of which not one is lacking in mendacity.

The first is where he says: Innocent III wrote in the chapter, *Cum Mathae,* concerning the celebration of Mass, that there are several words in the consecration of the chalice, which the Lord said in the Gospel, and they come from the apostolic Tradition. *However,* Kemnitius said, *the Pontifical authors have written down by which Roman Pontiffs those words were added.* This is a lie. For, Catholic authors indeed wrote down in the rest of the canon, which Pontiff added something; but in the words of consecration, no one is found who added anything; nor is there anyone in this matter who contradicted Innocent.

The second lie. *If anyone shows that he doubts in any way,* he said, *that the whole canon of the Mass is from the apostolic Tradition, he is to be punished with an anathema.* This is a lie. For, since in the canon there is a commemoration of many saints, some of whom lived 200 years after the Apostles, who can doubt that not the whole canon is from the apostolic Tradition? Or let Kemnitius say openly where he read what he so boldly affirms. Therefore, not the whole canon, but we say that the most important part and the principal part is from the apostolic Tradition, to which later the Sovereign Pontiffs added some things.

The third lie. *Alexander,* he said, *decreed that water should be mixed with the wine in the celebration of the Eucharist. The same man instituted holy water and blessed salt. Therefore, these rites are falsely attributed to the apostolic Tradition.* This is a lie. For, listen to the words of Alexander in his first letter: *Having rejected,* he said, *some opinions about the ceremonies, only bread and wine mixed with water are to be offered in the sacrifice. For there should not be (as we learned from the Fathers, and reason itself teaches us) in the chalice of the Lord the offering of wine alone or water alone.* Therefore it is true what Cyprian says in book 2, chapter 3 that this is a divine Tradition. For Alexander sufficiently clearly says that this practice was not started by him, since he says he received it from the Fathers. And concerning holy water, he does not say that he was the first one to order it blessed, but he indicates that he was following an ancient custom. For he says this: *We bless,* he said, *water sprinkled with salt for the sake of the people, etc.* Therefore it is rightly said to be an apostolic Tradition by Clement in book 8, chapter 35 of the Apostolic Constitution, and by St. Basil in his book on the Holy Spirit (ch. 27).

The fourth lie is that Telesphorus instituted the Lenten Fast. For. Telesphorus in his letter does not say that he instituted the Lenten Fast, but only that clerics added three days to the customary fast of all Christians, that is, they began to abstain from meat on Quinquagesima Sunday. *You should know,* he said, *that it has been established by us and by all the Bishops who have occupied this holy and apostolic See, that all clerics are*

to fast from meat for seven full weeks before Easter. What Jerome says in his letter to Marcella about the errors of the Montanists agrees very well with these words, namely, that the Lenten Fast was instituted by the Apostles in an unwritten Tradition.

The fifth lie. *Hyginus,* he said, *instituted the Chrism.* This is a lie without any foundation. For, in the letters of Hyginus nothing is found about the Chrism; nor is there among others any evidence of such a decree, except what Gratian says about consecration: distinction 4 of the canon, *In catechism* cites a certain decree of Hyginus, in which he states that he can be one and the same who receives the baptized and confirmed person, although it would be better if they were different. Therefore it is rightly said by Pope Fabian in letter 2 that the Chrism should be renewed each year, because the Apostles instituted it in this way.

The sixth one is this: *Callistus instituted the fasts for the Ember Days; therefore it is false that they come from the apostolic Tradition.* It is a lie that Callistus instituted all the fasts for the Ember Days; for he says in letter 1 that he added only one fast to the three that already existed. Therefore what Leo says in sermon 2 on the fast before Pentecost, and in sermon 8 on the fast of the seventh month, that those fasts come from the apostolic Tradition, does not conflict with the decree of Callistus.

The seventh is: *Sylvester invented the confirmation of youths.* This is an impudent lie. For no such thing from Sylvester has ever been read, and decrees of the Pontiffs are found much more ancient than Sylvester, in the catechism d. 4, the canon *In catechismo,* and the canon *Non Plures,* and d. 5 canons 1 and 2, and following; there it is not the Sacrament itself that is instituted, but certain rites surrounding its administration.

The eighth is: *Felix instituted the consecration of altars.* And this also is a lie. For, it is certain that Sylvester was the author of this rite, which concerns a stone altar and a solemn consecration. For before Sylvester, St. Dionysius the Areopagite wrote in his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy (c. 5, p. 1) that altars must be anointed with oil, and consecrated by a Bishop. It seems that Kemnitius was misled by letter 1 of Felix IV, where many things are disputed concerning the consecration of altars; but nothing new is established there, and only the ancient rites are explained.

The ninth is: *Felix IV instituted that the sick should be anointed before death.* This is a solemn lie. For, in Mark 6:13 the Apostles anointed the sick with oil. And in James 5:14 it is prescribed that the Priests should anoint the sick with oil. And Innocent I, a hundred years before Felix IV, in his first letter, which is to Decentius (ch. 8), says that the anointing of the sick is a Sacrament of the Church.

The tenth is: *Siricius added the commemoration and the invocation of the Saints to the Mass.* This also is a lie. For, Cyril of Jerusalem, who lived before Siricius, in his Catechetical Lectures (5) said: *When we offer this sacrifice, we mention those who went to sleep before us, first of all the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles, so that God because of their petitions will accept our prayers, etc.* And similarly in the liturgy of Basil, who lived before Siricius, we see that there was a commemoration and invocation of the Saints.

The eleventh is: *Pelagius added the annual commemoration of the dead to the Mass.* And this also is a lie. For, Tertullian many years before Pope Pelagius in his book *On*

Monogamy mentions that the annual offering for the deceased comes to us from the apostolic Tradition.

To the above we will now add a twelfth lie, from the book to which he gives the inscription: "The Principal Chapters of the Theology of the Jesuits." *You will note,* Kemnitius said, *O Reader, in this place, what difference the Jesuits make between the written Traditions of the Apostles, and between those that they themselves invent under the name of the Apostles. They say that the written ones are arbitrary, and they say that the invented ones obligate under danger of salvation.* This lie is so remarkable that Kemnitius gathers from it that the Colonienses had written this in the book against the Catechism of Monhemius: *For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you* (1 Cor. 11:23) does not mean *I commanded you,* but *I taught you;* and from that they deduced that one could not conclude from that text that the laity are bound to the use of the chalice in the Sacrament of the altar. But if that phrase "I delivered to you" does not mean "I taught you," but "I commanded you": then what, I ask, is the meaning? What does this mean: *I commanded you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, etc.?* Is it not that here history is being narrated, and not that a law is being constituted? Therefore, the Jesuits do not say that written Traditions are not binding, but they say that they are binding in a different way. When the Tradition is about a doctrine of the Faith or of some historical fact, it binds according to belief, but not to acting, like the Tradition about the death of Christ. But when it is about the precepts of morals, it binds regarding actions, and the same thing should be understood regarding what is unwritten.

CHAPTER IV

THE NECESSITY OF TRADITIONS IS DEMONSTRATED

Now in order to come to the proof, we will try to demonstrate three things. PíΓΞζ that the Scriptures without the Traditions were neither simply necessary nor sufficient; second, that the apostolic Traditions are found to be not only concerning morals, but also Faith; third, the way by which we can be certain about the true Traditions.

I will prove the first point from the various ages of the Church. For, from Adam to Moses the Church of God was in the world, and men worshipped God with Faith, Hope and Charity, and with external rites, as is clear from Genesis, where Adam, Abel, Seth, Henoch, Noah, Abraham, Melchizedek, and other just men are introduced; we know this also from book 11ff. of Augustine's *The City of God,* where he finds the City of God from the beginning of the world until the end. But before Moses there was no divine Scripture, as is evident, both because by the agreement of all Moses is the first sacred writer; and because in Genesis there is no mention of a written doctrine. God said in Gen. 18:19: *I have chosen him* (Abraham), *that he may charge his children and his household after him to keep the way of the Lord.* Therefore, the religion was preserved for two thousand years by Tradition alone; so Scripture simply is not necessary. For just as that ancient religion could be preserved without Scripture for two thousand years, so the doctrine of Christ could be preserved for fifteen hundred years without Scripture. Then from Moses until Chriſζ through another two thousand years, the Scriptures did indeed exist, but they existed only among the Jews, while the other nations, in which the true religion, and Faith, existed in a few people, used only the unwritten Tradition.

For, that besides the Jews many others belonged to the Church is clear from Job and his friends. Likewise from Augustine, who asserts this constantly in book 2, chapter 24 of his work on original sin, in book 1, chapter 9 on the predestination of the Saints, and in book 18, chapter 47 of *The City of God;* and in the people of God, although they had the Scriptures, still the Jews used Tradition more than Scripture, as is clear from Exod. 13:8: *You will tell your son in that day saying, this is what the Lord did, etc.* Deut. 32:7: *Ask your father and he will tell you, and ask your elders and they will tell you.* Job 8:8: *Inquire, I pray you, of bygone ages, and consider what the fathers have found.* Ps. 44:1: *We have heard with our ears, O God, our fathers have told us, what deeds thou didst perform, etc.* Ps. 78:5-6: *He commanded our fathers to teach their children; that the next generation might know them, the children yet unborn, and arise and tell them to their children.* Sir. 8:9: *Do not disregard the discourse of the aged, for they themselves learned from their fathers.* Nevertheless the book of Sirach is among the last books of the Old Testament.

But the reason why the Hebrews used Tradition more than Scripture seems to have been, because up to the time of Ezra the Scriptures were not produced in the form of books, so that they could be used easily and comfortably, but they were dispersed in various annals and papyri; sometimes, because of the negligence of the priests, for a long time they were not found, as is evident from 2 Kings 22:8f., where it is related as something new that in the days of Josiah a volume of the Law of the Lord was found in the Temple. But

after the captivity Ezra collected everything together and put it into one book, adding to Deuteronomy the last chapter on the death of Moses and some other things from various sources in order to complete the histoiy. On this matter see Theodoretus in the preface to the Psalms, Bedam in chapter 9 on the book of Ezra, and Peter Antonius Beuter in annotation 9 on Holy Scripture.

Moreover, after the coming of Christ for many years the Church was without Scriptures, so that even in his time Irenaeus writes in book 3, chapter 4 that there were some Christian Gentiles who lived very well only with the Traditions and without Scripture. Therefore from this deduction it is sufficiently apparent that the Scriptures are simply not necessary. However, Chiysostom says in homily 1 on Matthew that the Scriptures were not necessary for the Patriarchs and Apostles, but that for us, because of the corruption of men, they are necessary. This is understood as not simply necessary, but as necessary to live well, that is, they help us to do that; for because they were lacking at the time of the Patriarchs and Apostles there were many wicked men.

But that the Scriptures do not contain everything in such a way that they themselves are sufficient without other Traditions, I will prove this first of all: because either the whole canon of the Scriptures taken together is sufficient, or the individual books by themselves are sufficient. Kemnitius cannot say that the individual books are sufficient; for, then what he says would be false, namely, that Tradition was used in the Church until the completion of the whole canon of the Scriptures. Furthermore we see that the individual Evangelists do not have everything. For, John wrote nothing about the Annunciation, the Nativity, the Circumcision, the Epiphany of the Lord, and many other such things; the same thing can be said about the others. Similarly, if one book contains everything in a sufficient manner, what need is there for so many books? Finally, they clearly say that the whole canon is necessaiy so that sufficient doctrine may be had. But that is not true. For, many truly sacred and canonical books have perished. Therefore, we do not have, nor did we have for 1500 years sufficient doctrine, if everything is located in the Scriptures. For, Chiysostom teaches in homily 9 on Matthew that many books of the Old Testament have perished, when he comments on the words "he shall be called a Nazarene" (2:23): *Many things perished from the prophetic memoirs, and it is possible to prove this from the history of Chronicles. For you know that they were Jews, and you know that some were wicked; some prophecies perished out of negligence, but others they either burned or destroyed.* He teaches the same thing in homily 7 on 1 Cor.; and it is not possible to respond that all those that were destroyed were restored by Ezra; for, Chrysostom wants to prove that now not all of the prophecies of the Prophets exist, and he proves it, because the Jews lost many of them.

Furthermore, Ezra did not restore the lost books, but he corrected and assembled the existing ones. 1 Chron. 29:29: *Now the acts of King David, from first to last, are written in the Chronicles of Samuel the seer, and in the Chronicles of Nathan the prophet, and in the Chronicles of Gad the seer.* And 2 Chron. 9:29: *Now the rest of the acts of Solomon, from first to last, are they not written in the history of Nathan the prophet, and in the prophecy of Ahijah the Shilonite, and in the visions of Iddo the seer.* And 1 Kings 4:32: *He also uttered three thousand proverbs; and his songs were a thousand and five.* Where are all of these? From the New Testament it is probable that the letter of Paul to the Laodiceans has perished.

According to the opinion of some he mentions it Col. 4:16, and doubtless there was another one to the Corinthians, which seems to be mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:9 in these words, *I wrote to you in my letter;* and it could easily have happened that still others perished. Therefore let the heretics see how they can repair such an outstanding defect.

Second, this same point is proved from the distinction that exists between the preaching and the Scriptures of the Apostles. For, if it had been proposed to Christ and to the Apostles to confine and restrict the word of God to Scripture, then Christ would have clearly prescribed a matter of such great importance, and the Apostles would have said elsewhere that they were writing at the command of the Lord, just as they were teaching in the whole world because of a command of the Lord; but nowhere do we read that. Then, the Apostles did not wait for the given occasion or necessity to preach with a living voice, but by their own will and on their own initiative they undertook it vigorously; but they applied themselves to writing only because they were forced to do so by necessity.

Eusebius in book 3, chapter 24 of his History writes that Matthew wrote his Gospel, because when he had preached to the Hebrews, and then was preparing to go to the Gentiles, he judged it useful if he should leave a memorial of his teaching and preaching to those whom he had converted. The same Eusebius in book 2, chapter 15 of his History recounts that Mark, neither by his own will nor at the command of Peter (whose disciple he was), but compelled by the petitions of the Romans wrote his Gospel. Eusebius also says in book 3, chapter 24 of his History that Luke wrote his Gospel only because many others had presumed rashly to commit those things to writing which they did not know perfectly, so that he might certainly protect us against the uncertain narrations of others.

In the same place Eusebius reports that John until his extreme old age preached the Gospel without any Scripture, and Jerome adds, in his book on the Scriptures of the Church, that finally he was forced by the Bishops of Asia to write his Gospel because of the heresy of the Ebionites which was spreading at the time. Therefore, if the heresy of the Ebionites had not existed, perhaps we would not have St. John's Gospel, just as we would not have the other three, unless certain occasions had presented themselves. Rightly, therefore, Eusebius says in the same place, only two of the twelve Apostles wrote a Gospel, and they were provoked to do it because of a certain necessity.

Accordingly it is ciystal clear that the primary intention of the Apostles was not about writing, but about preaching the Gospel. Moreover, if they explicitly wanted to commit their teaching to writing, certainly they would have composed a catechism or something like it. But they wrote either history, like the Evangelists, or letters on some occasion, like Peter, Paul, James, Jude, John, and in them they treated disputes over doctrine only in passing. Finally, either the individual Apostles would have published an evangelical teaching, since each one had the care of a province, or certainly all gathered together at the same time, before they departed, would have published a common book in their own provinces, as it is certain that they jointly composed a Creed of the Faith; however, they did not write this down, but they handed it on by a living voice, as is taught by St. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 4, St. Jerome in his letter to Pammachus against the error of John of Jerusalem and by St Augustine in chapter 9 of his work on faith and works, St. Ambrose in letter 82 to Siricius, St. Leo in letter 13 to Pulcheria, Ruffinus and St. Maximus in their

explanation of the Creed.

Also, it is proved from the many things, which cannot be ignored, and nevertheless are not contained in the Scriptures. First of all, during the time of the Old Testament without doubt there was a remedy no less for women than there was for men, by which they could be cleansed of original sin. Nevertheless, according to the opinion of many, circumcision was instituted for the males, but what the rule was for females is found nowhere in Scripture.

Then, at the same time it is in no way credible that there was no remedy for males dying before the eighth day, when only they could be circumcised, and still there is nothing extant about this matter in Scripture.

Third, many Gentiles could be saved, and were saved during the time of the Old Testament, and truly belonged to the Church, as we showed above; and nevertheless there is absolutely nothing in Scripture about their justification from original sin and from their other sins.

Fourth, it is necessary to know that there are some divine books, which certainly can in noway be known from the Scriptures themselves. For, even if Scripture said that the books of the Prophets and Apostles are divine, still I cannot believe that for certain unless I already know that the Scripture which says this is divine. For, we also read here and there in the Koran of Mohammed that the Koran was sent by God from heaven, still we do not believe it. Therefore this very necessaiy dogma, namely, that there is a divine Scripture, cannot be proved sufficiently from Scripture alone. Therefore since Faith is based on the word of God, if we do not have the unwritten word of God, there will be no Faith for us.

Fifth, it is not enough to know that there is a divine Scripture, but it is necessary to know what it is—and this is something that cannot be had from the Scriptures. For how do we deduce from Scripture that the Gospels of Mark and Luke are true, but those of Thomas and Bartholomew are false? Because reason dictates that one should put more faith in a book prefaced with the title of an Apostle, than in one by a non-Apostle?

And from what source do I know that the letter to the Romans is truly by Paul, but that the letter to the Laodiceans, which is now being circulated, is not by Paul? Since both are entitled by Paul, and since Paul in Col. 4:16 says that he wrote to the Laodiceans, but says nowhere that he wrote to the Romans.

Sixth, it is also necessaiy to know not only which books are sacred, but also to know in particular that these, which are in my hands, are the same. For, it is not enough to believe that the Gospel of Mark is true, that the Gospel of Thomas is not true, but it is necessary also to believe that this Gospel, which is now read in the name of Mark, is the true and incorrupt one that Mark wrote. That certainly cannot be known from the Scriptures alone. For, how can I gather from Scripture that this Gospel is not a counterfeit, as the Mohammedans say, or certainly wholly corrupted, as the Manicheans said long ago, and the Anabaptists say now?

Calvin responds to these three questions in book 1 of his Institutes (ch. 7 § 1 and 2) that the sacred Scriptures can be discerned from the non-sacred per se, as light from darkness, sweet from bitter. But on the contrary: for if that were the case, why did Luther judge the letter of James to be made of straw, and Calvin that it is apostolic? Therefore Calvin adds in § 4 that this difference of the Scriptures is not apparent to all, but only

to those who have the spirit; for, a blind person cannot discern the difference between light and darkness. But on the contrary, for Calvin in the same place (ch. 9 § 1) contends that the Apostles and the faithful of the first Church had the true spirit; but they judged the book of Wisdom to be sacred, as Augustine testifies in chapter 14 of his book on predestination; but Calvin, who also boasts of having the spirit, says that that book is profane,

Moreover, the Ancients with one voice bear witness that we know that the Scripture is divine, and we know which sacred books are included in it, from no other source but the unwritten Tradition. Thus in book 6, chapter 10 of Eusebius's History, Serapion rejects certain writings falsely attributed to Peter, because he had learned from Tradition that Peter had not written such things. And in chapter 11 Clement of Alexandria, according to the Tradition recommended to him by his elders, teaches which are the true Gospels. And in chapter 18 Origen said: *From Tradition I learned about the four Gospels» that these are the only ones, etc.* Basil also in chapter 27 of his book on the Holy Spirit says, if the unwritten Traditions are neglected, it will happen that the Gospel will suffer great damage. Finally, Augustine, in chapter 5 of his treatise *Against the Letter Called Fundamental,* says that he would not believe the Gospel unless the Church prescribed it.

But Calvin insists: the Scriptures of the Apostles and Prophets are the foundation of the Church according to Eph. 2:20; therefore we do not believe that the Scriptures are divine from the Tradition of the Church, because then the Church would be the foundation of the Scripture.

I respond that the Apostle does not say that the writings of the Apostles and Prophets are the foundation, but the Apostles and Prophets. However, they not only wrote, but also handed on by word of mouth, and they taught that they had written. And so from the unwritten word of the Apostles, and through the Church by what has been handed on to us we know that there is a written word of the Apostles. But we covered this matter in the previous book.

Therefore Brentius in his Prolegomena, not finding any escape, admits that this one and only unwritten Tradition must be accepted. And Kemnitius teaches the same thing, while treating the nature of Traditions in his Examination of the Council of Trent. But if that is the case, then Scripture alone is not sufficienζ as they so often and so earnestly teach: for, if one rejects this unwritten Tradition, and the witness of the Church, then there will be little left.

Moreover, if this Tradition was able to come to us, why could not others also come to us by the same way?

Finally, this Tradition is either the word of God, or it is not; if it is not, then we do not have Faith, because Faith is based on the word of God. If it is, then why do they proclaim that there is no word of God except what is written?

Seventh, it is necessaiy not only that Scripture can be read, but also that it can be understood. But often Scripture is ambiguous and obscure, so that unless it is explained by someone who cannot err, it cannot be understood; therefore by itself alone it is not sufficient. There are many examples of this; for, the equality of the divine Persons, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as from one principle, original

sin, the descent of Christ into the underworld, and many similar things are deduced indeed from the sacred Writings, but not so easily that if one argues from the testimonies alone of the Scripture, debates with objectors can ever be brought to an end. For it should be noted that there are two aspects in Scripture: the written words, and the meaning included in them; the words are like a scabbard and the meaning is the sword of the spirit. Of these two, the first is had by all; for, whoever knows how to read can read the Scriptures; but all do not have the second 35ρβοζ and in many places we cannot be certain about this second 35ρβοζ unless Tradition is consulted. And perhaps this is what Basil wanted to say in chapter 27 of his treatise on the Holy Spirit when he says that without the unwritten Traditions the Gospel is a pure name, that is, it is only voices and words without any meaning.

Eighth, it must be believed that Blessed Mary was always a virgin, contrary to the error of Helvidius, as the whole Church has always believed; however, there is no testimony of this matter in the Scriptures.

Ninth, it must be believed in the New Testament that Easter is to be celebrated on Sunday; for, the Quartadecimani were considered to be heretics by the ancient Church; nevertheless, there is absolutely nothing about this in the Scriptures. The same can be said about many other things.

Tenth, it is necessary to believe, and the Lutherans and Calvinists do believe with us against the Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants is valid, but neither Catholics nor Lutherans can in any way prove this from the Scriptures alone. For they think that Baptism without real and actual Faith is not valid, and so they believe that infants, while they are being baptized, make an act of faith. This is something that not only Luther teaches in comments on Gal. 3, and Kemnitius in his Examination of session 7 of the Council of Trent, but also the general Synod of Lutherans at Wittenberg which defined it; but this can in no way be proved from the Scriptures. For where, I ask, does Scripture say that infants use their reason, before they have the use of reason, while they are being baptized? Hence the Anabaptists reduce the Lutherans to great distress, and force them willy-nilly to fall back on the Tradition and practice of the Church.

Eleventh, Luther believes in the existence of Purgatory. For he says the following in article 37: *But I also believe that Purgatory exists, and I advise and urge that it be believed.* Nevertheless in that same article 37 he says that Purgatory cannot be proved from the Sacred Writings.

Finally, all the contemporary heretics believe that there is no word of God except what is written; but this proposition certainly is found nowhere is all of Scripture. They usually cite especially Deut. 4:2: *You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it,* but this does not help their case because Moses does not say, *to the written word,* but *to the word which I command you.*

CHAPTER V

IT IS DEMONSTRATED FROM THE SCRIPTURES THAT THERE ARE SOME TRUE TRADITIONS

So far we have demonstrated that the Scriptures without the Traditions are not absolutely necessary, nor sufficient. Now we will show what I proposed in the second place, namely, that there are some true Traditions.

The first one can be gathered from what we have already said. For, if Scripture does not contain everything, and the handed on word is necessary, it follows that there is a word handed on, for otherwise God would not have provided well for the Church. Secondly, it is proved from the testimonies of the Scriptures. The first is John 16:12: / *have yet many things to say to you.* And John 21:25: *But there are also many other things which Jesus did; were every one of them to be written, I suppose that the world itself could not contain the books that would be written.* Therefore it is certain that the Lord did and said many things that are not written. For, one hand can hold the existing books; but John says that the whole world could not hold the books that would be written. Moreover, the things which the Lord in John 16:12 promised he would say, without doubt he did say after his resurrection, as Luke declares in Acts 1:3: *Appearing to them during forty days, and speaking of the kingdom of God.* But the Evangelists have written only a very few things about the deeds and words of the Lord after the resurrection. However it is in no way credible that the Apostles, who saw and heard those things, did not hand them on to the Church; for, they were not envious or forgetful to the extent that they did not want to or were unable to relate these things.

The objector responds: even if everything that Jesus said and did is not written down, still everything necessary has been written. But this claim has already been refuted. For, many necessary things have not been written, and especially about the institution of the Sacraments, which without doubt the Lord explained to the Apostles during those forty days.

The second testimony is 1 Cor. 11 where Paul treats two questions—one on the way of praying in Church, and the other about the way of receiving the Eucharist. The first begins from Tradition: *I commend you,* he said, *because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you* (v. 2). Now those precepts about the way of praying are nowhere to be found written. And Chrysostom and Theophylact say clearly at this place that the Apostle is speaking about unwritten precepts. The same point is made by Epiphanius in heresies 61, and Basil in chapter 29 of his book on the Holy Spirit, an Damascene in comments on 2 Thess. 2. Then, because something was still lacking in the traditional precepts, he adds that these points should also be observed—that men should pray in Church with the head uncovered, while the women should have the head covered (1 Cor. 11:3 ff.). And in order to show that much must be attributed to the Tradition and to the practice of the Church, even the unwritten ones, he concludes: *If anyone is disposed to be contentious, we recognize no other practice, nor do the Churches of God* (ibid., 11:16). Therefore he wants the contentious to be restrained by the practice of the Church.

He answers the second question also from the Tradition: *For I received from the Lord,* he said, *what I also delivered to you* (ibid., 11:23). And he concludes: *About the other things I will give directions when I come* (v. 33); but what directions he gave is written nowhere. But Catholics rightly think that he not only directed what pertained to rites and ceremonies, but that he also gave more important directions, like things concerning the Ordination of ministers, the sacrifice of the altar, the matter and form of the other Sacraments; and the heretics cannot in any way prove the contrary.

The third testimony is in 2 Thess. 2:15: *So then, brethren, stand firm and hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter.* Kemnitius and Hermannus respond to this text in two ways. First they say that the Apostle handed on the same things first by word of mouth, and then by letter, and therefore that he is not talking about an unwritten tradition. But this explanation is ridiculous. In the first place, because that disjunctive particle "or" clearly indicates that those things are different which he handed on and which he wrote. In the second place, because if that were so, the letter of 1 Thess. should contain all the doctrine which the Apostle preached to them. Without doubt he had preached the whole Gospel to them, as is also gathered from chapters 1 and 2 of his first letter to them; therefore it should contain the whole Gospel. However, it does not contain even one hundredth of it, as is clear.

Secondly they respond that the Apostle here is talking about the teaching, which he had given them orally, and which he had not written, but was written later by the Evangelists. For the Apostle, according to what they say, taught absolutely nothing which is not written somewhere in the New Testament. Brentius also in his Prolegomena endorses this solution. On the contrary. For, first of all, in this very chapter the Apostle says that he preached to them about the Antichrist, and in addition to other things, taught them when he is going to come: *And you know,* he said, *what is restraining him now.* And, *Do you not remember that when I was still with you I told you this?* (2 Thess. 2:5-6). But this is written nowhere, that is, when the Antichrist is going to come. Wherefore St. Augustine in book 20, chapter 10 of *The City of God* says that they knew what the Apostle taught orally, but we cannot know it because we did not hear the Apostle; therefore not eveiything was written that the Apostle said. Moreover, whether what the Apostle taught was written later or not written, does not make much difference for the argument that we derive from this text. For, the Apostle does not promise that he or someone else will write what he spoke to them orally, but he simply orders that they do not give less observance to what they received orally than they do to what they receive by letter. The ancient authors understood this text in this way.

Basil in chapter 29 of his treatise on the Holy Spirit said: *For I hold it apostolic to abide also by the unwritten traditions. I praise you, it is said, that you remember me in all things, and keep the ordinances as I delivered them to you* (1 Cor. 11:2). And, *Hold fast the traditions which you have been taught whether by word of mouth, or by letter* (2 Thess. 2:15). Chrysostom on this text said: *Hence it is clear that they did not hand on everything by epistles, but many things also without letters. Both the former and the latter are worthy of true faith.* Oecumenius and Theophylact use the same words concerning this passage, and Damascene agrees with them in book 4, chapter 17 of his work on

Faith: *Paul writes that the apostles handed on many things that were not written down. Therefore, brothers, stand firm and hold on to the Traditions, which you were taught whether by word of mouth or by letter.*

In contrast to these five Fathers, who clearly explain this text for us, Hermannus cites another five—Jerome, Ambrose, Primasius, Theodoretus and Anselm—whom, he says, explain this passage differently. But I respond: The Commentary in the letter attributed to Jerome was not written by Jerome, but by Pelagius the heretic, as St. Augustine teaches in his treatise on Merits and Remission of Sin (chapters 1,5 and 12), and in his Commentary on Rom. 5,7,8 and 9 he declares that Pelagius is the author of that letter.

Now in this matter Pelagius is really not against us, for he only says: *When he wants his own words to be observed, he does not want anything foreign added to them; but it is an apostolic Tradition according to which the Sacraments of Baptism are preached in the whole world.* How can this be against us? For we admit that extraneous things should not be added, that is, the foreign and false comments of the Pseudo-Apostles to the true dogmas of the Apostle. But what follows, is for us. For, Pelagius said that the Sacraments of Baptism are an apostolic tradition, not the Sacrament of Baptism, because he knew there are many mysteries concerning Baptism, which are preserved in the Church from the unwritten Tradition of the Apostles, like exorcism, breathing upon, anointing, etc.

Primasius is also on our side. For, first of all, he gives an explanation that is almost word for word the same as that of Pelagius, which we have already treated, and he adds that the Apostle is speaking not only about the Sacraments of Baptism, but also about the Traditions which are observed in the whole world, and which therefore are recognized as apostolic. Hermannus thinks he is speaking about the written Gospel, because it is preserved in the whole world; but he should acknowledge that there are many unwritten things preserved in the whole world, like the feasts of the Nativity, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, as St. Augustine teaches in letter 118. Moreover, when Primasius says that the Apostle is speaking about the Traditions that are recognized as Apostolic, because they are preserved in the whole world, without doubt he is speaking about what is unwritten. For certainly, since he is a disciple of Augustine, he knew that it is a rule of Augustine (in letter 118) that the things preserved in the whole world, even if they are not written, are derived from the Apostolic Tradition.

Ambrose is neither against us nor for us. For, he only says that the Apostle in this place is warning us to persevere in the teaching of the Gospel, but he says nothing about what is written or unwritten. Anselm, however, is for us. *Hold fast in your heart and in your deeds the Traditions, which you learned, whether from our words, while we were present with you, or by the letter which we sent you in our absence.* How is this against us? Is it not rather for us?

Finally, I think that Theodoretus is also for us. For he said: *You have the rule of doctrine, the exhortations which we gave to you, which while present we preached to you, and absent we wrote to you.* Hermannus says that this place favors his position, because Theodoretus seems to indicate that the Apostle wrote down those exhortations which he had previously preached, but Hermannus is in error on this point. For the words of Theodoretus can be understood to be about different exhortations in this way: *You have*

in the rule of doctrine the exhortations which, that is, those which we preached, and those which we wrote to you in a letter. It is clear that this meaning is closer to the mind of Theodoretus, both because it is more in conformity with the explanation of Chrysostom, whom Theodoretus is accustomed to follow in all things, and also because the prior meaning is false, since it is certain that not everything was written in that letter, which the Apostle had preached orally. Therefore our argument remains in all its vigor concerning that text of Paul.

The fourth testimony is 1 Tim. 6:20: *O Timothy, guard what has been entrusted to you.* And 2 Tim. 1:13-14: *Follow the pattern of the sound words which you have heard from me... guard the truth that has been entrusted to you by the Holy Spirit who dwells within us.* And 2 Tim. 2:1-2: *You then, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus, and what you have heard from me before many witnesses entrust to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.*

In these texts under the phrase "what has been entrusted to you" cannot be understood as Scripture, but the treasure of doctrine, the understanding of the divine dogmas, that is, both the meaning of the Scriptures, and of the other dogmas, all of which he wanted to be propagated by Tradition, as Chrysostom and Theophylactus explain in reference to this text. Irenaeus also alludes to this in book 3, chapter 4 when he says: *the Apostles like a rich man [depositing his money] in a bank, lodged in the hands of the Church most copiously all things pertaining to the truth.* And in book 4, chapter 43 he said: *Therefore those who are in the Church must obey those who have succession from the Apostles, who with the succession of the Episcopate have received the certain Chrism of truth according to the good pleasure of the Father.* And it is easily gathered from those words. For, if he were speaking about written words, he would not recommend so anxiously the protection of the deposit of faith, since the Scriptures are easily preserved in containers or libraries. But the Apostle wants it to be preserved by the Holy Spirit in the heart of Timothy. And then he would not have added: *Entrust it to faithful men who will be able to teach others,* but he would have said, *Entrust it to the Libraries, and make many copies.* And he would not have said: *What you heard from me before many witnesses,* but, *what I wrote to you.* Therefore, not only words, but also the meaning is to be preserved, and much more this meaning, which the Apostle recommends to Timothy, and which he commands him to give to his successors with his own hands. Concerning this passage, see the Commonitory of Vincent Lérins against the profane corruption of words.

The last testimony is in 2 and 3 John, since he says, *Though I have much to write to you, I would rather not use paper and ink, etc.* For from these words we understand that many things had been said by the Apostle John to his disciples, and through his disciples to the whole Church, which however were not written down.

CHAPTER VI

THE SAME IDEA IS SHOWN BY THE TESTIMONIES OF PONTIFFS AND COUNCILS

To the quotes from Scripture we will add a few testimonies of the holy Pontiffs and Councils. First, St. Fabian, Pope and Martyr, in letter 2 to the Eastern Bishops, after he had taught that the sacred Chrism is to be renewed each year, added the following: *We have received this from the holy Apostles and their successors, and we command you to observe this.* That is what he said, and certainly we read nothing in the sacred Scriptures about renewing the Chrism.

St. Innocent I in his letter 1, which is to Decentius, said: *If the priests of the Lord want to preserve the ecclesiastical customs intact, as they have been handed on by the Apostles, no change is to be introduced to the Orders and consecrations.* That is what he said. There he is talking about unwritten Traditions, and especially in chapter 3 where he teaches that Confirmation is to be conferred also on children, and only by the Bishop, and under a definite form of words; and so he is testifying that they are unwritten Apostolic Traditions, and in that letter he does not want to write down the form of the words. *Indeed, I cannot say the words,* he said, *lest I seem to go farther than to reply to the inquiry.*

St. Leo I said in sermon 6 on Lent: *The Apostolic institution is fulfilled by the fasting for forty days.* And in sermon 2 on the fast before Pentecost: *It should not be doubted, beloved, that every observance is in accordance with the divine teaching, and whatever has been received from the Church concerning the custom of devotion comes from the Apostolic Tradition and the teaching of the Holy Spirit.* See also sermons 8 and 9 on the fast of seven months.

Now the ancient and famous Council of Nicaea I relying on the unwritten doctrine condemned the heresy of Arius, as Theodoretus says clearly in book 1, chapter 8 of his Histoiy. For, although certain Scriptures could be quoted against Arius, still, because Arius also quoted Scripture in his own behalf, they condemned him relying on the unwritten doctrine, but handed on through the hands of the Fathers who succeeded each other in the Church.

Nicaea II in session 6 said: *Furthermore, along with many things, which have been handed down to us without being written, also, the making of images in the Church was approved by the preaching of the Apostles.* And in the decrees of session 7 we have the following: *If anyone rejects all ecclesiastical Tradition, written or unwritten, let him be anathema.* The same thing is found in general Council VIII, and in canon 1 the Fathers say that they will keep all the Traditions, not only Apostolic but also Ecclesiastical. Therefore it should not be surprising to Lutherans if the Council of Trent in session 4 taught something similar, since it did not establish anything new.

CHAPTER VII

THE SAME IDEA IS PROVED FROM THE FATHERS

Now we will consider the testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers, who teach this truth with extraordinary agreement. And to begin with the Greeks, St. Ignatius, as recorded by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 36 of his History, exhorted all to adhere tenaciously to the Traditions of the Apostles. *He asserts,* Eusebius said, *that he had those traditions written down as a precaution.* From this it follows that they were not written by the Apostles.

Hermannus gives no response to this testimony, except to say that there is no such writing of Ignatius. But it is false to say it does not exist; for, Jerome writes in his book on famous men that Ignatius wrote a letter to the Ephesians, to the Magnesians, to the Trallians, to the Romans, to the Philadelphians, to the Smymians, to Polycarp. All of them are now in existence, and in them we find reference to the Lenten Fast, minor Orders, the Lord's Day, and other things that are not in the Scriptures, which however Ignatius doubtless learned from the Apostles.

Dionysius the Areopagite, in chapter 1 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy said: *Our first leaders in the sacerdotal ministry handed on to us a summary of those very substantial elements regarding the instructions that were partly written and partly unwritten.* Luther, Calvin and the others are wont to respond to these and similar statements that the books attributed to Dionysius were not written by Dionysius. But these works are cited under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite by the VI, VII and VIII general Councils; likewise they are cited by Gregory I in his homily on the hundred sheep, by Martin I at the Roman Council, and by Agatho in his letter to the Emperor Constantius; because of this, the heretics are forced to admit that this author wrote over a thousand years ago, and therefore he is not to be contemned.

According to Eusebius in book 4, chapter 8 of his History, Hegesippus included the Apostolic Traditions in five books, and although they no longer exist, still this testimony indicates sufficiently that the Apostles did not write down everything they taught. Polycarp in book 5, chapter 29 of Eusebius's History mentions some words, which were spoken by the Lord, and which he himself had heard from the Apostles, and also about his virtues and doctrine. Irenaeus, however, as recorded in the same place, wrote down some of the things said by Polycarp, not on paper but on his own heart.

But nevertheless Kemnitius responds that Eusebius is speaking about the Traditions that can be proved from the Scriptures; for, he says there that everything Polycarp said is in agreement with the Scriptures. But Kemnitius is in error, for it is one thing to be in agreement with the Scriptures, and something else to be able to be proved from the Scriptures. For, every true Tradition, in fact every truth is in agreement with the Scriptures, because the truth cannot disagree with the truth; however, not every truth can be proved from Scripture.

Justin at the end of his second Apology for Christians, after he explained many things about Christians, and among other things some things not written in the divine books (for instance, that they gather together every Sunday, and after the reading of the Scriptures

and a sermon, bread and wine mixed with water are offered and consecrated, and that it is not allowed to participate in the Eucharist except after Baptism, and other things); then he adds immediately: *On the day after Saturday, 'which is Sunday, when he appeared to his Apostles and disciples, he handed on to them these things, which we allow you also to consider, etc.* And although Justin also did not say that these things were handed on by Christ, still since Justin was very close to the times of the Apostles, it is necessaiy to believe that what was done at that time in the Church was decreed by the Apostles. For who else could be imagined to be the author?

Hermannus and associates have almost nothing to respond to these quotes and similar ones of Cyprian, Ambrose, Hilary, Jerome, and others, which we will adduce, except to say that they all erred somewhere. But this does not damage our case. For, although some of the Fathers erred concerning some dogmas, still never did all of them at the same time agree regarding the same error. Therefore, when we show that all of them agreed in affirming unwritten Traditions, we prove in a sufficiently effective way that they did not err concerning that point.

Irenaeus in book 3, chapters 2, 3 and 4 says many outstanding things about the Traditions, which however by Brentius and Kemnitius are understood in a different sense, about which Irenaeus never thought. Brentius says that Irenaeus is talking about the Tradition of Scripture, that is, about the Tradition whereby through the historical succession of the Fathers we understand which are the true Scriptures. But his own words teach us that this was not the intention of Irenaeus, as we see in book 5, chapter 4. *But what if the Apostles,* he said, *had not left us the Scriptures: would it not be necessary to follow the order of Tradition, which they handed on to them, and which they committed to the Churches? Many nations of barbarians follow those orders; of whom those who believe in Christ, without paper and ink, have salvation written on their hearts through the spirit, and they carefully guard the ancient Tradition.* If Irenaeus is speaking about the Tradition of Scripture, why is it that those barbarians had and carefully guarded the Tradition, since they did not have any Scriptures?

However, Kemnitius says that Irenaeus is speaking about the Tradition only of those dogmas, which are found in the Scriptures, and which can be proved by the Scriptures. But the words of the same Irenaeus teach that this also is false; for, in chapter 2, 3 and 4 he teaches that there is no other way of arriving at the truth than by consulting the Churches in which there is the succession of the Bishops from the Apostles, and by considering what is taught there and which those Churches say is the Apostolic Tradition. Therefore, Irenaeus wants to extend Tradition beyond the Scriptures; and he also says that the meaning of difficult texts of Scripture cannot be derived from Scripture, but from Tradition, so that Tradition alone suffices, but the Scriptures are not sufficient. But all of this would be false, if Tradition contained nothing other than what is obviously gathered from the Scriptures, as Kemnitius imagines it.

Therefore, after he had said in chapter 2 that heretics cannot be convinced from the Scriptures, and in chapter 3 he has listed the Roman Pontiffs from Peter to Eleutherius, who was then reigning, in order to show that there is in the Church a continuing succession of Bishops preserving the Apostolic Tradition, he then says the following in chapter 4:

Since therefore we have such proofs, it is not necessary to seek the truth among others which it is easy to obtain from the Church; since the Apostles, like a rich man [depositing his money] in a bank, lodged in her hands most copiously all things pertaining to the truth: so that every man, whosoever will, can draw from her the water of life. For she is the entrance to life; all others are thieves and robbers. On this account are we bound to avoid them, but to make choice of the things pertaining to the Church with the utmost diligence, and to lay hold of the tradition of the truth. For how stands the case? Suppose there arise a dispute relative to some important question among us, should we not have recourse to the most ancient Churches with which the Apostles held constant intercourse, and learn from them what is certain and clear in regard to the present question? For how should it be if the Apostles themselves had not left us writings? Would it not be necessary, [in that case,] to follow the course of the tradition which they handed down to those to whom they did commit the Churches? To these words should be added what Irenaeus says in book 4, chapter 43: *Those who have succession from the Apostles, those who have received with the succession of the Episcopate the certain charism of truth according to the benevolence of the Father.* Here you see how the Apostles handed on to their successors not only the Scriptures, but also the certain charism of truth, that is, the true understanding of the Scriptures and the whole evangelical doctrine.

Clement of Alexandria in his book on the Pasch, as it is found in chapter 11 of Eusebius's book on History, says that he was compelled by the brothers to write down in books and hand on to posterity the things that had been said to him orally by the elders who succeeded the Apostles. I do not know what could be said more clearly about the Traditions. Origen in his comments on Rom. 6 said: *The Church received the Tradition form the Apostles that Baptism should be given also to children.* And in homily 5 on the book of Numbers he said: *In the ecclesiastical observations there are some, which all are supposed to do, but the reason for them is not clear to all.* And he lists immediately many unwritten Traditions.

Eusebius in book 1, chapter 8 of his *Demonstratio Evangelica* said: *Moreover, Moses wrote on inanimate tablets, while Christ wrote on minds endowed with life the perfect documents of the New Testament. But his disciples, in imitation of their Master, accommodating his doctrine to the ears of many, handed on to those who could understand all the precepts they had from their perfect Master; but for those who were less gifted and had souls subject to passion and suffered from weakness or ignorance, they adapted themselves by commending the truth to them partly in writing and partly without writing, in accordance with a certain unwritten law.*

Athanasius in his book on the decrees of the Council of Nicaea I against Eusebius: *Behold,* he said, *we have demonstrated from the Fathers to the Fathers that this decree has been handed down to us. But you, O new Jews and disciples of Caiaphas, which progenitors of your words can you show?* And Basil in chapter 27 of his book on the Holy Spirit said: *Of the beliefs and practices, whether generally accepted or publicly enjoined which are preserved in the Church, some we possess derived from written teaching; others we have received delivered to us in a mystery by the tradition of the Apostles; and both of these in relation to true religion have the same force. And these no*

one will gainsay—no one, at all events, who is even moderately versed in the institutions of the Church. And he immediately enumerates several unwritten Traditions; and he says similar things in chapter 29.

Kemnitius responds: the things Basil mentions are not dogmas of Faith or morals, but only certain free rites, like making the sign of the cross, adoring God facing Eθ5ζ blessing water, etc. But Kemnitius should remember that he said that it cannot be shown for certain that any rite was instituted by the Apostles. However, here Basil boldly lists several established by the Apostles. Then, although the observation of some of these rites is not necessary for salvation, nevertheless it is necessary for salvation to believe that they were well instituted, and not to despise them; just as many things in the Scriptures are not necessary for salvation, as that a man should pray with his head uncovered, and a woman with her head covered (see 1 Cor. 11:7-9), and still it is necessary for salvation to believe those things, and not to despise them.

Finally, Basil not only mentions some rites, but also some that are essential, like the confession of Faith, that is, the Apostles' Creed, which we have from Tradition, and the anointing of oil in the Sacrament of Confirmation. He also mentions some other ones, which although of themselves are not necessary, still after they have become precepts, they are so necessary that if they are deliberately omitted, one sins gravely, like making the sign of the cross in the consecration of water, of the Eucharist, of the Chrism; and also there is the renouncing of Satan and his pomps in the rite of Baptism, etc. For, Augustine says in tract 118 on John that without the sign of the Cross no Sacrament is conferred rightly; and Chrysostom teaches the same thing in homily 55 on Matthew.

Brentius, however, responds more shamelessly that these opinions of Basil are from the faults and errors of Basil, which should be covered over with silence because of the dignity of such a man; and he calls us pigs and imitators of Cham, who uncover the turpitudes of our Fathers. For, he thinks that what Basil says is not to be tolerated, that is, that the pedagogical Traditions of the sign of the Cross and of holy water, have the same power for piety (as he says), as the Holy Scriptures with the dogmas.

But without using insults, for we should not return evil for evil, I now respond to what Brentius objects: it is right to equate the Traditions with the Scriptures. For, since in the Scripture certain things are a major precept, like to love God, but others are less important, like not to utter an idle word—these things are not equally binding for observation, and still they bind equally for the Faith and veneration (for he is not less a heretic, who does not believe, or does not venerate the Scripture which says: *On the day of judgment they will give an account of every idle word,* than someone who does not believe or does not venerate this precept: *You shall love the Lord your God, etc.).* Thus also concerning the Traditions, some are major and some are minor with regard to the obligation of observing them, and still all are equally binding with reference to the Faith and veneration. In the same way, there are some Traditions that are more binding than some things in the Scriptures, some less and some equal; but all Scriptures and all Traditions are equal with regard to the Faith and veneration that are due to them, because they come from the same author, God, and they come to us through the hands of the same Catholic Church, which is our mother and the spouse of Christ.

Finally, Hermannus, not being content with what Brentius and Kemnitius had said, adds this: *All those things are not from Basil, but they were inserted in Basil's book by some worthless fellow.* This of course is a very self-serving response; for, in this way it is easy to solve all arguments. Nor does Hermannus offer any proof, except the testimony of Erasmus, who seems to have detected some kind of diversity of style in these chapters. But St. John Damascene, much older and much more learned and more conversant with Basil's writings, was not able to detect any such thing. For, he (and I omit several more recent authors) in Oration 1 on the holy images says this: *Thus St. Basil says literally in the twenty-seventh chapter of his book, which he wrote on the Holy Spirit in thirty chapters to Amphilochius: The things preserved in the Church, and the customs that are preached—consist partly from written doctrine, and partly from the Tradition of the Apostles, etc.*

Gregory Nazianzen in Oration 1 on Julian (near the middle), after he had said that because of the dogmas of the Old and the New Testaments the doctrine of the Church seemed to Julian to be wonderful, he adds immediately: *Moreover, there is the greater and more remarkable form of the Church handed on to us, and preserved until this present day, etc.* But later he explains that by the figures of the Church he means the discipline, the governing, the order of the Church, the way of singing, the way of imposing penance, the sacred rites in temples, the monasteries of monks, the convents of virgins, and many other things which are had only from Tradition. Julian wanted Gentiles to imitate all these things so that in this way he might more easily attract the Christians to paganism.

Chrysostom in his comments on 2 Thess. 2 said: *It is obvious that the Apostles did not hand on everything in writing, but many things without writing. Both the former and the latter deserve the same faith.* Theophylact and Oecumenius say the same thing. Here one should note this: since Basil, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Oecumenius equate Traditions with the Scriptures, what is to be made of the censure of Kemnitius, who says: *It is an absolutely immense audacity to equate anything with the authority and majesty of Scripture;* and passim he ridicules the Council of Trent, which with the same feeling of piety venerates Traditions and Scripture. The same Chrysostom in homily 9 to the people, and homily 3 on the letter to the Philippians said: *Not in vain was it decreed by the Apostles that, in the celebration of the sacred mysteries, a commemoration should be made of those who have departed from this world. They knew that this would be of great assistance to them.*

Theophilus in books 1 and 3 on the Paschal Feast clearly teaches that the law of fasting is an Apostolic Tradition. Cyril of Jerusalem in his Mystagogical Catechism explains almost nothing else but the unwritten Traditions about Baptism and the other Sacraments. Epiphanius in Heresies 55, which is on Melchizedek, said: *Limits have been established for us, and foundations, and the building up of the Faith: the Traditions of the Apostles, and the Holy Scriptures, and the succession of doctrine, and in every way the truth of God is defended; and no one is deceived by new fables.* Likewise in Heresies 61 he speaks about things apostolic: *It is necessary also to use Tradition, for not everything can be derived from divine Scripture. Therefore, the holy Apostles handed on some things in the Scriptures, and some things in Tradition.*

TO these points they given no response, except by blaspheming and saying that Epiphanius took too much delight in Traditions and apocryphal fables, etc. And among other things Brentius thinks it intolerable that Epiphanius said that it is an Apostolic Tradition that it is not allowed to marry after having taken a vow of virginity, since that is what the first parents of the Lutherans did, namely, Luther and Catherine, but this will be treated elsewhere in its proper place.

Damascene in book 4, chapter 17 said: *The Apostles handed on many things that are not written, etc.* He also has many things to say about holy images.

Concerning the Latin Fathers, Tertullian in chapter 3 of his treatise on military service said: *Also in the claim of Tradition, as you say, there must be some written authority. Therefore we ask, whether the unwritten Tradition should not be accepted. Surely we will deny that it should be accepted, if they offer no examples of other observations, which without the help of any Scripture, but only with the title of Tradition, we then vindicate with the protection of a custom.* Then, after having mentioned the ceremonies of Baptism, the sign of the Cross, the annual Sacrifice for the dead, and some other things, he adds in chapter 5: *If you demand the law of the Scriptures for these and similar disciplines, you will find none: Tradition is given to you as a helper, a custom, a confirmer, and observer of Faith.* He also teaches that Tradition must be used in book 1 *Against Marcion,* in book 2 *To His Wife,* in the book *On the Veiling of Virgins,* and the book on *The Prescription against Heretics,* where he teaches according to custom that heretics are to be refuted not from Scripture, but from Tradition. What the adversaries respond to these texts has already been refuted when we treated Irenaeus and Basil.

St. Cyprian in book 1, letter 12 said: *The one who is baptized must also be anointed, etc.* But it is certain that there is nothing about anointing in the Scriptures, but only in Tradition. The same saint said in book 2, letter 3: *You know that we have been warned that in the offering of the chalice the Tradition of the Lord is to be observed; and nothing else is to be done by us but what the Lord did for us previously, that is, that the chalice, which is offered in memory of him, is to be offered mixed with wine.* Kemnitius responds that Cyprian is talking about the written Tradition. But that is false, because the Evangelists make no mention of water. Hermannus says: because it is not written that the Lord put water in the chalice, it is better not to put it in, for that is what the Lord did. But since neither action is written, it is amazing that Hermannus assumes that one should believe him rather than Cyprian.

Brentius resorts to insults, for he says that Cyprian was always too forceful in asserting his own opinions, and that he said these things inconsiderately. And Brentius's reason is, because Cyprian seems to prove this rite with an inept argumentation; for he says: *Water should be mixed with the wine, because wine signifies Christ and water signifies the people of the Church; and when the water is mixed with the wine, the Church is joined to Christ. But if only wine were consecrated, then Christ would begin to be without the Church. This certainly seems to be ridiculous. For who would believe, if one priest did not mix water with the wine in the chalice, Christ would immediately lose the Church?* But Brentius does not seem to notice, or perhaps does not want to notice, that Cyprian is not dealing with a real joining or separation of Christ and the Church, but only

with one that signifies. For in the matter of the Sacraments we argue correctly from an imperfect signification. Moreover, Cyprian does not want that rite to be preserved for that reason alone, but because the Lord taught it thus; but that reason was added in order to show that the Tradition is in conformity with reason. Wherefore, even if Cyprian did not offer a suitable reason, on that account it should not be denied that this rite is to be preserved, or that it was handed on by the Lord.

St. Hilary, in his book against the Emperor Constantius (near the middle), when the Arian Prince objected: *I do not want unwritten words to be read,* responded with these words: *Pray then, I ask, who gives commands to the Bishops? Who forbids the form of apostolic preaching? Speak first, if you think rightly that it should be said; I do not want to make use of new types of medicine against new poisons.* With these words Hilary is making two points: first, that the preaching of the consubstantiality of the Father and the Son is from the apostolic preaching, although it was not written that the Son is consubstantial with the Father; second, that the word itself ὁμοούσιος is indeed new, but it is to be retained, even though it is not written, because it is in harmony with the apostolic preaching.

Hermannus distorts this text with his gloss, for he explains it in this way: *This question, I ask: who gives command to the Bishops,* that is, *that they say something outside the Scripture.* But if that is a correct gloss, then Hilary is agreeing with Constantius; therefore it is in bad form that he adds, *Speak first, if you think rightly that it should be said; I do not want to make use of new types, etc.* How can this be, since in almost the whole book Hilary is arguing that the word ὁμοούσιος should be retained? But according to the gloss of Hermannus he would wish rather that it be abolished.

St. Ambrose in chapters 2 and 6 of his book *On the Christian Faith,* and in book 1, chapters 1 and 2 *On the Mysteries,* explains the rites which are observed by the whole Church concerning Baptism, which are found written nowhere in the divine Writings, and which others constantly refer to the Apostles as the authors. In sermons 25, 34 and 36 he teaches that Lent was prescribed by Christ. In letter 81 and sermon 38 he teaches that the Apostles' Creed is an unwritten Tradition. Hermannus blasphemes much against Ambrose, but he presents nothing opposed to our thesis.

St. Jerome in his letter to Marcella on the error of Montanus said: *We fast for forty days according to the Tradition of the Apostles.* Likewise in the Dialogue against the Luciferians (near the middle), since the heretic had said: *Many things, which by Tradition are observed in the Church, have usurped authority for themselves from the written law,* the orthodox Jerome responds: *Indeed I do not deny that this is a custom of the Churches, but why do you transpose the laws of the Church into heresy?*

Now St, Augustine said in letter 118: *But the things we guard, which are not written but handed on, and which are observed in the whole world, we are given to understand are either from the Apostles themselves or from the general Councils, whose healthy authority in the Church must be commended and retained; such as that the Passion of the Lord, and Resurrection, and Ascension into heaven, and the descent from heaven of the Holy Spirit are celebrated with an annual solemnity.* To this Hermannus responds, while he babbles many things and then finally concludes: *Why, Augustine, do you with*

the other Fathers of the Church swallow Traditions that are outside the Scripture? Therefore, Hermannus admits that Augustine with the other Fathers acknowledges the unwritten Traditions. Surely this confession ought to be sufficient, if it had any trace of reasonableness in order to restrain his petulance.

But Brentius responds in two ways. First, he says: If it is true that this is an apostolic Tradition, it should not be accepted as a necessary law, but as an optional observance. On the contrary: for, Augustine in the same place adds this: *But other things, which in various lands and regions, are done differently, are considered as optional observations.* Here Augustine distinguishes between these necessary apostolic Traditions and optional observances. Second, Brentius says that Augustine is teaching falsely that those feasts are from the apostolic Tradition, since the Apostle argues in Gal. 4:10 that they observe the days and the seasons. But Augustine responds in letter 119 (chapter 7) that the Apostle is reprehending those who observe the seasons according to the rule of the Astrologers. And in the *book Against Adamantins* (chapter 16) he says that the Apostle is speaking about the feasts of the Jews, not of the Christians. This is the way Jerome and Chrysostom explain it; and Ambrose embraces both explanations together.

But the same Augustine in book 2, chapter 7 of his *On Baptism, Against the Donatists,* said: *I believe that this custom came from the Apostolic Tradition, like many things which are not found in their letters, nor in the Councils of their successors, and nevertheless, because they are preserved throughout the whole Church, they are believed to have been handed on and recommended only by them.* And in book 4, chapter 6 he goes on to say: *But this custom, which even then those who looked back to past ages could not find to have been invented by men of a later time, is rightly believed to have been handed down from the Apostles.* And in book 4, chapter 24: *What the whole Church holds, and what was not instituted by Councils, but as a matter of invariable custom, is rightly held to have been handed down by the Apostles.* And in book 5, chapter 23 Augustine said: *The Apostles, indeed, gave no injunctions on the point; but the custom, which is opposed to Cyprian, may be supposed to have had its origin in apostolic tradition, just as there are many things which are observed by the whole Church, and therefore are fairly held to have been enjoined by the Apostles, which yet are not mentioned in their writings.* The same Father in his book *On the Unity of the Church* (chapter 22) said: *Here perhaps you will say, read to me how Christ ordered those to be received, who wanted to go over from the heretics to the Church. Neither I nor you clearly and evidently read such a thing, etc.* And further on he adds: *Since this is read nowhere, it must be believed because of the testimony of the Church, which Christ assure us is truthful.* He has something similar in book 1 of his work *Against Crescon.* (chapters 31, 32 and 33).

To these affirmations Kemnitius has two responses. First, that Augustine's question in those places is, whether an example from Scripture could be produced, whereby a re-baptized heretic was said to have been received, or he was received without a new Baptism; but not whether heretics should be re-baptized or not re-baptized; and also that Augustine thought that such an example could not be found, and that he was teaching that in the cited texts. Secondly, he says that Augustine without doubt believed that there are certain clear testimonies in the Scriptures, by which it is proved that a heretic should not

be re-baptized, and therefore that this Tradition is written.

He proves the first point from book 1, chapter 33 against Crescon., where Augustine says: *Therefore, since an example of this matter certainly is not found in the canonical Scriptures, etc.,* and he says something similar in chapter 19 of his treatise on the unity of the Church. He proves the second point, first, from book 1, chapter 7 *Against the Donatists: Lest I seem to rest on mere human arguments... I therefore bring forward from the Gospel clear proofs.* Secondly, from book 2, chapter 14: *But which is worse, not to be baptized at all, or to be twice baptized, it is difficult to decide... but when I have recourse to that divine balance, in which the weight of things is determined, not by man's feelings, but by the authority of God, I find a statement by our Lord on either side.* Thirdly, in book 4, chapter 6: *To this we may add that it may also be said, after a careful inquiry into the reasoning on both sides of the discussion, and into the evidence of Scripture, what truth has declared, that we follow.* Fourthly, in book 4, chapter 24: *We can form a true conjecture of the value of the Sacrament of Baptism in the case of infants, from the parallel of circumcision.* Fifthly, in book 5, chapter 4: *And let any one, who is led by the past custom of the Church and by the subsequent authority of a plenary Council, and by so many powerful proofs from Holy Scripture... and by the clear reasoning of truth, to understand that the Baptism of Christ, consecrated in the words of the Gospel, cannot be perverted by the error of any man on earth.* Sixthly, in book 6, chapter 1: *It might perhaps have been sufficient, after the reasons have been so often repeated, and considered, and discussed with such variety of treatment, supplemented too, with the addition of proofs from Holy Scripture, etc.* Seventhly, in book 5, chapter 23: *By what authority of Holy Scripture is it shown that it is against the commandment of God that persons coming from the society of heretics, if they have already there received the Baptism of Christ, are not baptized again? But it is clearly shown.* Eighthly, in book 5, chapter 26: *But the admonition that he gives us, that we should go back to the fountain, that is, to apostolic tradition, and thence turn the channel of truth to our times, is most excellent, and should be followed without hesitation. It is handed down to us, therefore, as he himself records, by the Apostles, that there is "one God... and one Baptism."*

I respond to the first point that Kemnitius is mistaken; for, although Augustine in that place in book 1, chapter 33 against Crescon. deals with some examples, nevertheless in other cited places he is not treating examples, but precepts, or with the documents of Scripture, especially in book 5, chapter 23 *Against the Donatists* where he says: *There are many things which are observed by the whole Church, and therefore are fairly held to have been enjoined by the Apostles, which yet are not mentioned in their writings.* Furthermore, also in that one place the main question was not about the example, or about a fact, but about a law. For, we know that he was treating the question of re-baptism which existed between Catholics and Donatists; but it is certain that the Donatists did not dispute about examples, but about the law.

However, because in this dispute the heretics asked that the Catholics provide an example in the Scriptures of someone received into the Church without having been baptized, Augustine responded that there are no such examples in the Scriptures, either for one side or for the other. Hence he concluded, since in the Scriptures there are not

only no precepts but also no examples, one should abide by the custom of the Church, which is rightly thought to have been introduced by the Apostles. But that these things are so, is clear both from the places cited, and from the fact that if the main question were about examples, the Donatists would not have been heretics, nor would they have erred in any way; for, it is true that they said, and Augustine also agreed with them, that there is no example in the Scriptures about this matter.

To the second point I have two things to say. First, we are not citing those places mainly because he says that the custom of not re-baptizing is from the apostolic Tradition, but because he adds that many things are preserved from the apostolic Tradition that are not written down. For, this principle for Augustine was so certain that from it he wanted to prove that also the custom of not re-baptizing was handed on by the Apostles. Therefore, we rely more on this principle of Augustine, than on his conclusion. But Kemnitius opposes us, as if we were relying only on the conclusion.

Secondly, I say that Augustine thought that that custom could never be sufficiently proved from the Scriptures, and therefore he cited reasons and Scriptures from what any source he could find. Still he thought that the main foundation was to be found in Tradition, which the custom of the Church declared, and which also later a general Council declared, as is clear from the cited texts, both from book 2, chapter 4 *Against the Donatists,* where he thought it was that it was not a clear testimony of Scripture on this matter, so that he said: *Nor should we ourselves venture to assert anything of the kind, were we not supported by the unanimous authority of the whole Church.* And this whole matter will become more clear by responding to each text quoted by Kemnitius.

To the first quote from book 1, chapter 7 *Against the Donatists,* I respond: with bad faith some words were omitted by Kemnitius, which were in the middle. For, after Augustine had said, *Lest I seem to rest on mere human arguments, etc.,* he added what Kemnitius omitted: *since there is so much obscurity in this question... it has caused men of great weight, and even our fathers, the Bishops, whose hearts were full of charity, so to dispute and doubt among themselves, saving always the peace of the Church, that the several statutes of their Councils in their different districts long varied from each other, till at length the most wholesome opinion was established, to the removal of all doubts, by a plenary Council of the whole world;* and then finally he adds: *I therefore bring forward from the Gospel clear proofs.*

Therefore, Augustine said that the question could not be answered from the Scriptures before a plenary Council of the Church, but after the Council explained the doubt and the whole question, now certain proofs of Scripture can be brought forward. For, the Scriptures explained by the Council prove firmly and certainly what previously they did not prove firmly. The text from the Gospel, which St. Augustine proposes, shows that this is true. For he cites Luke 9:50: *Do not forbid him; for he that is not against you is for you.* In this text it is shown that outside the Church there can be some gifts of God, like the gift of driving out demons; but whether among those gifts Baptism must also be included, cannot be deduced from that text alone.

To the second point I respond: that place does not concern our thesis. For, there Augustine proves from the Scriptures that it is not permitted to re-baptize, when someone

once has received Baptism in the Catholic Church, but he does not prove that the Baptism of heretics is a true Baptism, and that is what our question is concerned with. For, he wanted to teach in that place that those who acknowledged that they had acted badly by re-baptizing Catholics could be admitted by their repentance. And he does not offer any other testimony of Scripture except that of John 13:10: *He who has bathed does not need towash again.* From this text no one would conclude that the Baptism of heretics is valid, but only (which Augustine does conclude) that after a true Baptism another Baptism should not be added to it, which the Donatists also did not deny.

To point 3,4,5 and 6I say that Augustine there is offering conjectures from Scripture, whereby, after the definition of a Council and the investigated unwritten Tradition, they have some value in confirming the truth; however, per se they are not sufficient. This is clear from Augustine's words, where he always places the Scriptures after the custom, and the Council, and he uses the words: *To this can be added; We can conjecture; When the Scriptures also are added, etc.*

To the seventh point I say that Kemnitius has cited it in bad faith. For those words, *By what authority of Holy Scripture is it clearly shown,* do not refer to what went before, as Kemnitius says, but to what follows and which he omitted. For thus Augustine says: *But it is clearly shown that many pretended Christians, though they are not joined in the same bond of charity with the saints, without which anything holy that they may have been able to possess is of no profit to them, yet have Baptism in common with the saints.* There St. Augustine says it is certain from the Scriptures that many Christians baptized in the Church lose charity, but they do not lose their Baptism, which is a point that the Donatists also conceded; however, he does not say it is certain from the Scriptures that the Baptism given by heretics is valid.

Moreover, even if those words referred to what went before, still Kemnitius would not have a proof. For there also Augustine does not say it is certain that the Baptism of heretics is valid, but he says it is certain that the person who receives the true Baptism of Christ, must not be re-baptized, which the Donatists also conceded. But afterwards the question still remained: whether or not the Baptism of heretics is a true Baptism of Christ.

To the eighth point I say that there Augustine does not prove his opinion from the Scriptures, but is referring to how the adversaries were trying to prove from Scripture their contrary opinion.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED BY FOUR OTHER ARGUMENTS

Besides the common consensus of the Fathers, the consensus of the heretics in rejecting the Traditions suggests the same conclusion. For just as from the common consent of the holy Fathers of all times, who accept the Traditions, we gather that they should be accepted; so also from the common consent of the heretics of all ages, who reject the Traditions, we gather that they should not be rejected. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 2 and Tertullian in *On Prescription* testify regarding the Valentinians and the Marcionists that they rejected the unwritten Traditions of the Church.

Cyprian also, when he wanted to defend the error of re-baptism, could not do it any other way than by appealing from Tradition to Scripture, as is apparent from the letter of Cyprian to Pompey, and from another letter to Jubajanus. Although previously Cyprian had acknowledged the Traditions, as we showed above, St. Augustine thinks (in letter 48 to Vincent) that he also rejected this later error before he died.

The Donatists also always pushed the Scriptures, and St. Augustine counters them with the Traditions and customs of the Church, as he says in book 19 in his treatise on the unity of the Church.

Hilary bears witness that the Arians in no way admitted anything besides the Scriptures. In his book against Constantius he introduces an Arian saying: *I do not want words to be read that are not written.* The Arian Maximinus in Augustine's book 1 against him says this right at the beginning: *If you say something from the divine Scriptures, which are common to all, it is necessary that we hear it. But those words that are outside Scripture are in no way acceptable to us. Moreover, since the Lord himself warns us and says: In vain do they worship me, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men* (Matt. 15:9). Epiphanius says the same thing (Heresies 69 and 73).

Epiphanius writes in Heresies 75 that the Arians also rejected the Traditions. It is clear from Basil in his book *On the Holy Spirit* (chapters 27 and 29) that the same thing applies to the Eunomians. Basil says the same about Nestorius, Eutyches, and Dioscorus. St. Bernard says the same thing about the heretics of his time in homily 66 on the Canticle of Canticles. Thomas Waldo says the same thing about John Wycliffe in book 2, chapter 19 in his work on the doctrine of the Faith. From these, therefore, as if it were handed to them, Lutherans get their dogma about rejecting the Traditions; and we learned from our holy Fathers that we should receive them with every honor.

To this can be added the custom of all Nations. For that the Jews had some Traditions outside the Scripture is taught by Origen in homily 5 on Numbers and in his commentary on Rom. 3, and Hilary on Psalm 2 and also Anatotius, an ancient Christian author mentioned by Eusebius in book 7, chapter 28 of his History. And although there are not lacking some Catholics who deny that there were any unwritten Traditions among the Jews, yet I cannot agree with them, since, as we said above, the old written law did not contain everything adequately, and that people for a long time lived without a written law, even after the birth of Moses.

Also, all secular Republics in large part are governed by unwritten laws. Pericles, as reported by Thucydides, divided the law of the Athenians into written and unwritten. Aristotle in book 3, chapter 11 of the *Politics* said that the city should be ruled partly by good laws and partly by the authority of the best man, and in book 5, chapter 4 he calls a judge or arbitrator the living law. Further, among the Lacedemonians Lycurgus did not want to give any written law, as Plutarch says, but to live by the Traditions alone, so that they might be more diligent in acting than in reading. It is quite apparent that Cicero, from his first book on the laws, endorsed the same idea. And Caesar in book 6 of his Gallic Wars writes the same thing about the wise men among the Galls.

Pythagoras and Socrates, two outstanding Philosophers, taught many things but they did not write anything, as St. Augustine teaches in book 1, chapter 7 of his book *On the Harmony of the Gospels,* except that Socrates put the written fables of Aesop into verse. Finally, in the Civil Law, *De legibus,* and in the Canon Law, *Consuetudo,* the same authority is given to the written law and to the unwritten customs. Therefore, nature herself, in a certain way, seems to require that the unwritten Traditions are both necessaiy and useful.

The dignity of the Catholic Church should also be mentioned here. For, as of old the Jews excelled all other nations, because the words of God had been entrusted to them, as is said in Rom. 3, so now the Catholic Church excels all Sects, because she alone is the spouse of Christ and knows all the mysteries of the true religion and knows the secrets of her spouse; on this account she is called the pillar and bulwark of the truth (see 1 Tim. 3:15). But if everything were written, and out in the open, as the heretics say, there would be no special privilege of the Church; for, heretics, and pagans, and Jews would know nothing less about the mysteries of our Faith than we ourselves and our Leaders know. And it would not be true what Irenaeus says in book 3, chapter 4, namely, that the truth is to be found nowhere else but in the Catholic Church, the sole depository of apostolic doctrine.

Finally, we can add to this the dignity of many mysteries, which require silence, and it is not proper that they should be explained in Scriptures that are read throughout the whole world. For if to see the tremendous mysteries of the Mass it is not allowed to admit those who are not baptized, how can it be allowed to give them the same things in written form? Hence the Lord explained the parables for the disciples privately, which he had spoken to the people (see Luke 8:9ff.); and the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 2:6, *Among the mature* we *do impart -wisdom.* And the ancient Fathers, when they speak about the Sacrament of the Eucharist, are wont to say passim: *the faithful know about this, the initiated know about it.* Those who give expression to this reasoning are Dionysius in chapter 1 of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, Origen in homily 5 on Numbers, Basil in chapter 27 of his treatise on the Holy Spirit, and Innocent I in his first letter.

CHAPTER IX

FIVE RULES ARE EXPLAINED BY WHICH WE CAN ACQUIRE KNOWLEDGE OF TRUE TRADITIONS

Now we will show by what ways and reasons one must proceed in order to discover which are the true and genuine Traditions of the Apostles.

Therefore, the first rule is: When the whole Church embraces something as a dogma of Faith, it is necessary to say that it comes from the Tradition of the Apostles. The reason for this is, because, since the whole Church cannot err, since she is the pillar and bulwark of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15), and since concerning her the Lord said in Matt. 16:18, *The powers of death shall not prevail against it,* certainly what the Church believes concerning Faith, doubtless is a matter of Faith; but there is nothing of Faith, except what God revealed through the Apostles or Prophets, or what obviously is deduced from it. For the Church is not now ruled by new revelations, but she perseveres in those things which the ministers of the word handed on to her, and for this reason it is said in Eph. 2:20, *she is built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* Therefore everything that the Church holds by Faith has been handed on to her from the Apostles and Prophets, either written or oral. Included are such things as the perpetual virginity of Blessed Mary, the number of canonical books, and similar things.

The second rule is: When the whole Church observes something, which no one could establish except God, but which is found written nowhere, then it is necessary to say that it has been handed on by Christ himself and the Apostles. The reason is similar to what was said above: for, the whole Church not only cannot err in believing, but also she cannot err in acting, and especially in the divine rites and worship. And Augustine teaches rightly in letter 118 that it is a sign of impudent madness to think that what the whole Church does is not done properly. Therefore the things that the Church cannot rightly observe, unless they were instituted by God, and nevertheless does them, concerning them it is necessary to say that they were instituted by God, even if it is read nowhere. Such is the Baptism of infants; for the Church would err grievously, if without the command of God she baptized infants, who cannot make an act of Faith. For this reason, Augustine in book 10, chapter 23 on Genesis said: *The custom of mother Church in baptizing infants should not in any way be spumed, nor in any way be considered superfluous, nor would it be believed unless it were an apostolic Tradition.* An example is that the Baptism of heretics is valid, and because of that Augustine always invokes the Tradition of the Apostles with regard to the command of not re-baptizing those baptized by heretics. For, the Church cannot confer authority on Baptism, if she does not have it from Christ.

The third rule is: What has been observed in the Church, and in all past times, rightly is believed to have been instituted by the Apostles, even if it is of such a nature that it could be instituted by the Church. This is a rule of Augustine in book 4, chapter 24 in his book *Against the Donatists.* An example is the fast of forty days: it could have been instituted by the Church, if Christ or the Church had not instituted it; but we say and can prove that it was instituted by Christ or the Apostles, because by going back

in history and seeking the origin of this practice, we do not find it except in the time of the Apostles. Calvin, however, in book 4, chapter 12 § 20 teaches that Lent is a mere religious observance, coming neither from Christ nor from the Apostles, but invented by later generations.

St. Bernard in sermon 3 on Lent says: *Hitherto we fasted alone until the ninth hour, now (in Lent) all likewise fast with us until vespers—Kings and Princes, Clerics and the people, all together both rich and poor.* Before Bernard, Gregory in homily 16 on the Gospel mentioned Lent, and he gave the reason why we fast for forty days. Before Gregory Leo spoke about Lent in sermon 12. Before him there was Augustine in letters 118 and 119 and sermon 44 on Lent. Before him Jerome on Matt. 9, on Jonah 3 and elsewhere; Paulinus in letter 6 to Amandus, Chrysostom in homily 1 on Genesis and elsewhere. Before these, there were Ambrose in sermon 8 on Lent, Epiphanius in the compendium of doctrine, Basil in oration 2 on fasting, Nazianzen in his oration on the holy washing, and Cyril in his Catechism (ch. 1). Before these, Origen in homily 10 on Leviticus; before him, Irenaeus in book 5, chapter 24 of Eusebius's History. Before him. Pope Telesphorus in his letter of decrees. Before him, Ignatius in his letter to the Philippians, and Clement in book 5, chapter 13 and canon 13 of the Apostolic Constitutions.

Similarly Calvin says, in book 4, chapter 19 § 24 of the Institutes, that the minor Orders are a recent invention, which is not found anywhere, except among the inept Pettifoggers, Sorbonists and Canonists. But we can show from an established rule that they are an Apostolic Tradition. For, long before the Sorbonists and the Canonists there was Isidore, who in book 7, chapter 12 of his Etymology enumerates the individual Orders, and he explains the reasons for the names. Before Isidore, there was the Council of Carthage IV, in which in canons 1 to 10 the rite is explained by which Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, Acolytes, Lectors, Exorcists and Porters are to be ordained. And before this Council there was Jerome, who in comments on Titus 2 mentions all the Orders, except the Acolytes, whom he does mention in his letter to Nepotian on the life of a cleric.

Before Jerome there was the Council of Laodicea in whose chapter 24 all the minor Orders are named. Before that Council Pope Cornelius, in his letter to Fabian at Antioch, which is found in book 6, chapter 33 of Eusebius's History, said that in the Roman Church during his time, besides the Bishops, there were 46 Priests, seven Deacons, seven Sub-Deacons, and 42 Acolytes. But even before Cornelius, Ignatius greets by name all the Orders in his letter to Antioch.

The fourth rule is: When all the Doctors of the Church with common agreement teach that something comes to us from the Apostolic Tradition, whether they are assembled together in a general Council, or writing separately in their books, that must be believed to be an apostolic Tradition. There is a reason for this rule, because if all the Doctors of the Church, when they agree on some point of doctrine, could err, the whole Church would err, since she is held to follow her Doctors, and she does follow them. An example of the first part of the rule is the veneration of images, which the Doctors of the Church assembled at the general Council of Nicaea II said is from the apostolic Tradition. An example of the second part is hardly found, if absolutely all the

Fathers who wrote must say something expressly about it. However, it seems to suffice, if some famous Fathers speak about it expressly, and the others do not contradict them, when they are discussing the same matter. For then it can be said without being rash that it is the view of all; for, when one of the Fathers erred in a grave matter, many are always found who contradict him.

By this rule we prove that the rites are an apostolic Tradition, which are observed in Baptism: that the one who is to be baptized, is to be baptized with water blessed previously by the priest; that he is commanded to renounce Satan and his pomps; that he is marked with the sign of the cross; that he is anointed with blessed oil, etc. For, this was clearly stated by Basil in chapter 27 of his treatise on the Holy Spirit, by Tertullian in his work on military service, and by others; but no one ever contradicted this, since there is almost not one of the ancient Fathers, who did not mention these ceremonies as accepted by all in the Church. Similarly, with this rule I could also firmly prove that Lent is of divine or apostolic Tradition, because it is clearly affirmed by Irenaeus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Ambrose, Leo, and no one contradicts it, while all make some mention of this observance.

The fifth rule is that that must without doubt be believed to come from the apostolic Tradition, which is considered as such in those Churches, where there is an integral and continuous succession from the Apostles. Irenaeus states this rule in book 3, chapter 3, and also Tertullian in his book on prescription. The reason for the rule is that the Apostles handed on to their successors along with the office of the Episcopate, also the doctrine of the religion.

If therefore in some Church, by going back through the Bishops succeeding each other, we arrive at one of the Apostles, and if it cannot be shown that any of those Bishops introduced new doctrine, then we are certain that the Apostolic Traditions have been preserved there. And indeed in time past a non-interrupted succession was found, not only in Rome, but also in Ephesus, Corinth, Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and elsewhere; and on this account Tertullian refers men to any of the Apostolic Churches so that they can find there the apostolic Traditions; and Theodotius I orders all to observe the faith which at that time was preached by Damasus in Rome and Peter in Alexandria-two bishops of the principal apostolic Churches. But now the certain succession in all the Apostolic Church is lacking, except in Rome, and therefore from the testimony of this Church alone a certain argument can be arrived at in order to prove the apostolic Traditions. And this is especially so, since the doctrine or rites of those Churches differ from the doctrine and rites of the Roman Church.

CHAPTER X

THE OBJECTIONS OF THE ADVERSARIES, WHICH ARE TAKEN FROM THE SCRIPTURES, ARE ANSWERED

The last part of the question remains, in which the arguments of the adversaries will be explained and answered. There are three kinds of arguments—one from the Scriptures, the second from the Fathers and the third from reason. From the Scriptures. First, they propose those which command that nothing should be added to the word of God. Second, they propose those which say expressly that the Scriptures are sufficient and contain everything necessary. Third, they propose those which openly condemn the Traditions.

Therefore, the first argument is based on three texts: Deut. 4:2: *You shall not add to the word which I command you.* Rev. 22:18: *If anyone adds to them, etc.* Gal. 1:8: *But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel except that which we preached to you, let him be accursed.* Here Kemnitius points out that he does not say "contrary" *(contra),* but "except" *(praeterquam).* And lest we say that Paul is speaking about both the written and the unwritten word, he quotes Augustine who gives this explanation in book 3, chapter 6 in his *Answer to Petilian: Furthermore, whether concerning Christ, or concerning His Church, or any other matter whatsoever which is connected with your faith and life, to say nothing of ourselves, who are by no means to be compared with him who said, "Though we," at any rate, as he went on to say, "Though an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which" you have received in the lawful and evangelical Scripture, "let him be accursed."* Basil says something similar in his Summary of Morals (sum. 72, c. 1).

First of all, I respond to the first quote from Deut., where he is not speaking about the written word, but about the living voice; for, he does not say literally "what I wrote," but "the word which I commanded you." Secondly I say that the true explanation of this text is that God wants his commandments to be observed completely and perfectly, just as he commanded, and that they should not in any way be distorted by a false interpretation. Therefore, he does not want to say: *you shall not observe anything other than what I now command, but in what I command you shall not change it by adding or subtracting, but you shall keep the whole law, as I command, and not otherwise.* Scripture is wont to say this same thing with these words: *You shall not turn aside to the right or to the left.* And it is obvious that this is true, because otherwise the Prophets and Apostles, who afterwards added so many things, would have sinned.

Brentius, Kemnitius and Calvin respond: the prophets did not add anything to the Law, with regard to what concerns doctrine, but they only wrote some prophecies about the future, and they explained the teaching of the Law. The New Testament also is not an addition to the Old, but an explanation, because the Apostle in Rom. 1:2ff. says that the Gospel was promised by God through the Prophets in the Holy Scriptures. And in Acts 15:12ff. the Apostles did not dare to say anything during the Council without the testimony of Scripture.

On the contrary, for in this way also the Traditions are not additions, but explanations.

For, the writings of the Prophets are not contained in the Law of Moses, nor is the New Testament contained in the Law and the Prophets, except in general, and as it were virtually, as the whole tree is contained in the seed. For, we have in the Law the words in Deut. 18:15: *The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet... him you shall heed.* There whatever Christ did and said is contained in a general way; but in particular that Christ had to preach the Trinity of persons in God, institute the Sacraments, perform various miracles, etc., is not contained there.

But what they allege from Acts 15 is really against them. For, although James in the Council proved from the Scriptures that the Church was to be built from the Gentiles, the decree of that Council is found nowhere in the Scriptures of the Old Testament. For they decreed that the Gentiles need not observe the Jewish legalities, except to abstain from blood and what is strangled; the second part of this decree is read nowhere in the Old Testament. For where, I ask, did any Prophet foretell that during the time of the Messiah blood and what is suffocated are to be forbidden?

Thus also because it is written in 2 Thess. 2:15: *Hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth or by letter.* And Luke 10:16: *He who hears you hears me.* And Matt. 18:17: *If he refuses to listen even to the Church, let him be to you as a Gentile and tax collector.* Therefore we say that the Traditions are in a certain sense explanations of the written word; it is not that they contain its plain explanation, but because the Traditions and decrees of the Church are contained in the Scriptures in a general way; but they are not contained there in particular, nor ought they to be so contained. Therefore Augustine says in book 1, chapter 33 against Crescon.: *Although a certain example is not found in the canonical Scriptures, nevertheless the truth of the same Scriptures is maintained by us when we do what is in agreement with the whole Church, which the authority of the Scriptures themselves recommends.*

To the second quote given above: it is certain that John there is forbidding the corruption of that book, but not that other books should not be written, or that other dogmas should not be handed on, otherwise he would be acting against himself, since, according to Kemnitius on page 202 of his Examination, he wrote his Gospel after the book of Revelation.

To the third quote given above: on this text Brentius and Kemnitius place great emphasis; there are two answers to it and both are solid. The first one is that the Apostle is not speaking about the written word alone, but about every word, whether written or traditional. For, he does not say, if someone should evangelize contrary to what we have written, but contrary to what we have preached. The words of Augustine and Basil are not opposed to this; for they are not explaining directly this place, but they are proving from this text that it is not permitted to assert anything contrary to the Scriptures; and that is true. For, since Paul is speaking in general about apostolic preaching, and it is partially written and partially unwritten, from that we can rightly prove that it is not permitted to assert anything against the written preaching of the Apostles. For, from a universal negation an argument to a particular negation can rightly be made; but one cannot argue the contraiy way. And similarly we can argue from this word of Paul against those who preach against the already accepted Traditions of the Church, even if they seem to preach

from the Scriptures, as Athanasius excellently teaches in his work on the Incarnation of the Word, and Cyril when he quotes Athanasius near the beginning of his work on the right faith.

Another solution is that by the word "except" *(praeter)* the Apostle means "contrary." And therefore he does not prohibit new dogmas and precepts, provided they are not contrary to what has already been handed on; but it does prohibit dogmas and precepts that are contrary and foreign. This is clear first of all, because the Apostle himself later taught many things; and after this letter John wrote Revelation and his own Gospel. Secondly, based on the preaching of the Apostles, he is speaking against those who taught that the Jewish legalities should be observed, while he taught that they should not be observed. Therefore, when he says *"praeter,"* he understands it as "contrary to." Thirdly, from another place, where the Apostle uses the word *"praeter"* in this way. For, in Rom. 16:17 he said: *Take note of those who create dissensions and difficulties, contrary to the doctrine which you have been taught.* In this place it is so clear that *"praeter"* means "contrary to" that Erasmus translates it as "contrary to." In both places, however, there is the same Greek word, παρά. Fourthly, from the explanation of the Fathers: St. Ambrose says, *If on the contrary;* St. Jerome says, *If in a different way.* Chrysostom, Oecumenius, and Theophylact say that the Apostle did not say, *if contraries,* but *if contrary to that which we preached to you, etc.,* in order to indicate that not only are they accursed who openly teach things contrary to the whole doctrine, but also those who in any way, whether openly or covertly, corrupt anything in the traditional doctrine.

St. Basil in his work on Morality (72, chapter 1) (Kemnitius cites this passage for his own argument) teaches that from this place it is established that those should be accepted who preach what is in agreement with the Scriptures, and those rejected who teach foreign things. Finally, St. Augustine in book 17, chapter 3 in his work *Against Faustus* explains the word *"contra";* and in Tractate 98 on John he says this: *He does not say, More than you have received; but, Other than you have received. For had he said the former, he would be prejudging himself, inasmuch as he desired to come to the Thessalonians to supply what was lacking in their Faith. But one who supplies, adds to what was deficient, without taking away what existed: while he that transgresses the rule of Faith, is not progressing in the way, but turning aside from it.*

They take the second argument from the texts which seem to indicate that Scripture sufficiently contains everything, and there are two of them. First, there is John 20:30: *Now Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his name.* There John points out that he wrote, not everything but the things that are sufficient. For if we can have life through the things that have been written, what more do we need?

Kemnitius confirms this by three quotes from the ancient Fathers. Thus Augustine said in Tractate 49 on John: *The holy Apostle says that the Lord Christ did and said many things, which are not written: however, those things were chosen to be written which seemed to suffice for the salvation of believers.* And the same Augustine in book 1, chapter 35 of his work *On the Harmony of the Gospels* said the following: *For all that*

He, that is Christ, *was minded to give for our perusal on the subject of His own doings and sayings, He commanded to be written by those disciples, whom He thus used as if they were His own hands.* Cyril in book 12 on John 21: *Not everything the Lord did was written down, but what was written was thought to suffice both for morals and for dogmas, so that being illuminated by the right Faith, by works and by virtue we might arrive at the kingdom of heaven.*

The second place is 2 Tim. 3:16: *All scripture is inspired be God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness, that the man of God may be complete, equipped for every good work.* This place is the Achilles heel of Brentius and Kemnitius. That *all Scripture* does not mean just any sacred book, but the whole body together with the canonical books. For what follows, *profitable for teaching, for reproof, etc.,* cannot apply to any one book, but only to all Scripture. But that, *it is profitable,* does not mean that Scripture is profitable in the way in which profitable is distinguished from the necessary and sufficient, but it means that Scripture was made as the means to perfect the man of God: it is as if Paul would say, "Scripture has this use, was made for this, is directed to this." It is as when we say that food is useful to nourish a man, but he cannot live without it.

But the words "for teaching, for reproof, etc." explain the sufficiency of Scripture. For, only four things are necessary for the man of God, that is, for the Christian teacher. First, that he can teach the doctrine of the Faith. Second, that he can refute errors against the Faith. Third, that he can teach the doctrine of morals. Fourth, that he can correct those erring in the area of morals; but Scripture does all of these things. For, it serves for teaching, that is, the dogmas of the Faith; for arguing, that is, to refute those erring in Faith; for instructing injustice, that is, for teaching the precepts of justice; for rebuking, that is, to teach the precepts of morals; Paul concludes from this that the man instructed in Scripture is perfect, and suitable for every good work.

I respond to the first point: in that place John is talking about only the miracles of Christ, and says that he mentioned only some miracles, not all, because those were sufficient to persuade the world that Christ is the Son of God. For he also says this: *Jesus did many other signs in the presence of the disciples, etc.* But Kemnitius inappropriately transfers what is said about miracles to all the dogmas of Faith, and the precepts of morals. Moreover, John is speaking only about the things written by himself; therefore, if they are sufficient, all the other Scriptures will be superfluous.

Kemnitius responds that John is speaking about all Scripture. But John refutes this lie when he says: *Now Jesus did many other signs, which are not written in this book.* But that this is added, *but they are written, etc.,* does not mean that the signs alone aie sufficient for us for salvation, but that they are referred and ordered to it, and are one of the means necessary for our salvation, although alone they are not sufficient.

To those places of Augustine and Cyril I say: those Fathers are speaking only about the words and deeds of Christ; and therefore they wanted to say that not absolutely everything was written sufficiently, but all the words and deeds of Christ. Besides the words and deeds, many other things are necessary, otherwise all histories, and documents of the Old Testament, and the Acts of the Apostles, and the letters of Peter, Paul, John,

James, and Jude would be superfluous. And this does not conflict with what we said above—that the Scriptures are not absolutely necessary. For, although a knowledge of the many things which Christ and the Apostles said and did is necessary, still that knowledge, even without the Scriptures, could be had by Tradition alone, although it is in no way to be denied that the principal events should be written down.

Add to this that those Fathers without doubt from the words and deeds of Christ do not understand that everything absolutely necessary was written down sufficiently, but what was written down sufficiently was what the Apostles thought should be written. For, since some things were to be written, and some things were to be handed on in un written form, and especially the interpretation and understanding of the Scripture; in the sacred books everything is contained sufficiently, which was commanded to be written, or (as Augustine says) what Christ wanted to be read. For, he wanted other things not to be read in the divine writings, but to be received by the Church; but these things also, in their own way, are contained in the Gospel, not indeed in particular, but in general, because the Gospel warns us to consult the Church in doubtful matters.

To the other place from Paul one can respond in the same way, namely, that Scripture instructs us sufficiently, and perfects the man of God, because it contains many things expressly; and what it does not contain, it tells us where to seek it. Then I say: Paul in that place does not attribute even this sufficiency to Scripture, and this is deduced for two reasons. First, from that "all Scripture"; secondly, from the phrase "is profitable." For, when he says "all Scripture," he is attributing praise not only to the whole body of the Scriptures, but also to the individual books, which are profitable for teaching, for reproof, etc., and nevertheless Kemnitius says that any individual sacred book is not sufficient.

But that this is not so is clear first of all from the very way of speaking. For, by the judgment of all who know Latin, what is said about all Scripture that is divinely inspired, is said about the individual books that are divinely inspired. In the second place, because, when this letter was written, the book of Revelation did not yet exist, nor the Gospel of John, and perhaps something else was still lacking from the body of the Scriptures. Therefore, he is not speaking about the whole body of the Scriptures. Thirdly, from the reasoning of the Apostle. For, from this universal principle he wanted to conclude to a particular—the Scripture of the Old Testament; because it was inspired by God, it was profitable for teaching, for reproof, etc. For, he says also: *from childhood you have been acquainted with the sacred writings,* (that is, the Old Testament; for, when Timothy was a child, the New Testament did not yet exist, obviously, and the adversaries admit this) *which are able to instruct you for salvation though Faith in Christ Jesus.* There the Apostle in a few words attributes to the Scripture of the Old Testament everything that he attributes thereafter in many words to all Scripture. And lest Timothy have doubts about that, the Apostle proves it by adding: *all scripture is inspired by God, etc.*

There is no obstacle in the fact that Kemnitius objects that all these helps are not found in any one book; for, this is false that they are not found. For, there is no part of Scripture shorter than the second letter of John, yet in it we see preached that Christ is the true Son of God, which is a dogma of Faith. Also, we see preached that we should love one another, which is a doctrine of morals. Moreover, we see clearly written in it that they

are the Antichrist who say that Christ did not come in the flesh, which pertains to refuting heretics. Finally, we see that they are reprehended who say "Hello" to heretics, which pertains to the correction of morals.

Now that expression "it is profitable," however it is twisted by Kemnitius, still will never mean "it is sufficient." For whatever he proves, he does not deduce from that word that Scripture is not sufficient; nor is it deduced that Scripture is sufficient, which was what he had to prove. For, whether you say, "Scripture is profitable for this," or "it has this use," or "it is referred and ordered to this," or anything else like that, you will never signify that it alone suffices. Just as also someone may say, food is useful to nourish a man, surely is saying that food was instituted for this purpose that it nourish, but he is not saying that food alone suffices. For, if the natural heat is lacking, or some organ of the body necessary for nutrition, the food will not nourish. Therefore, the Apostle does not say that Scripture alone suffices for teaching, for reproof, etc. and therefore suffices to perfect a man; but it does help and contribute to all of these things.

And although the Apostle himself does not say "it does not suffice," nevertheless we gather that from his other statements: like 1 Cor. 11:34, *About the other things I will give directions when I come,"* And 2 Thess. 2:15, *Hold to the traditions which you were taught by us, either by word of mouth of by letter.* And also from this place, although it is not concluded that Paul said, *Scripture is not sufficient;* still it is evidently gathered that he did not say, *Scripture alone suffices,* because he attributes these praises to every canonical work, and we know also from the admission of the adversaries that not just any canonical work suffices, because then the others would be superfluous.

The third argument is from texts in which Traditions are condemned. Mark 7:7: *In vain do they worship men, teaching as doctrines the precepts of men.* Matt. 15:6: *For the sake of your tradition, you have made void the word of God,* Gal. 1:14: *I was extremely zealous for the traditions of my fathers.* Col. 2:8: *See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy and empty deceit, according to human tradition.* 1 Tim. 1:4: *They should not occupy themselves with myths, etc.* 1 Pet. 1:18: *You were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your fathers.* Here the traditions are condemned, which the Jews claimed they had received by hand from Moses and the Prophets. Therefore similarly the traditions are thought to be condemned, which we say have come down to us from Christ and the Apostles through the hands of the Fathers.

I respond that Christ and the Apostles did not reprehend the Traditions, which the Jews had received from Moses and the Prophets, some of which were from the canonical books, which were true, and some were not true; but the traditions which they had received from some more recent sources, some of which were inane and others perverse and contrary to the Scriptures. For Christ or the Apostles never called them the Traditions of Moses and the Prophets; and they say clearly that they are speaking about those that are opposed to the Scriptures. Moreover, the old Fathers explained clearly who the author was of the traditions, which Christ and the Apostles reprehended.

Irenaeus in book 4, chapters 25 and 26 argues against the old heretics who thought that under the name of Traditions reproved by Christ and the Apostles the Law of Moses was understood, and he teaches that it was not the Law of Moses, but the traditions of

the more recent elders corrupting the Law that was reproved by Christ and the Apostles. Epiphanius against the heretic Ptolemy teaches that the traditions of the Jews were four explanations of the sacred books. The first is of Moses, and that is not reproved. The second is that of Rabbit Akibam. The third is that of Rabbi Juda. And the fourth is that of the sons of Asamonaeus, and these were what were reproved by the Lord.

Jerome in his commentary of Isa. 8 and Tit. 3, and in this letter to Algasias (question 10), teaches that the Jewish Traditions reprehended by the Lord took their beginning from Sammai, Kittel, Achiba and some others, who lived shortly before the birth of the Savior, who did not so much explain the Law as to corrupt it; and they called these traditions δευτερώσεις. Concerning these there is in the civil law a certain constitution of Justinian which in number 146 is spelled out in these words: *This deuterosis, which is said by them to be like a secondary Tradition, we forbid in general, since it is not contained in the sacred books, nor handed down from above by the Prophets, but it contains certain excerpts of men who speak only about earthly things and do not have anything of the divine will in themselves.* Also, from these sources come the fables, which are now found in the Talmud, and in almost all the books of the Rabbis. But they have nothing to do with our Traditions, which have Christ and the Apostles as their authors, and are in harmony with the divine Scriptures.

CHAPTER XI

OBJECTIONS FROM THE FATHERS ARE ANSWERED

NOW we have to respond to the testimonies they bring forth from the Fathers. Therefore, Kemnitius first of all quotes Irenaeus, book 3, chapter 1, where he says the following: *It was not through others,* he said, *that we come to know the way of salvation, but through those through whom the Gospel came to us: what they preached then, afterwards through the will of God they handed on to us in the Scriptures—the foundation and pillar of our faith.* Therefore, said Kemnitius, all the Apostles wrote down what they had preached with a living voice.

I respond that Irenaeus does not say that the Apostles preached nothing other than what they wrote, but only that they wrote the Gospel which he had preached before; this is true and is not opposed to our thesis. But even if Irenaeus had said that the Apostles wrote down everything they had preached, that would say nothing against our position. For, there are two things to note carefully, both regarding this text of Irenaeus, and in order to understand many other thing of the ancient authors.

The first is that certain things in Christian doctrine, both of Faith and of morals, are simply necessary for all for salvation, such as the knowledge of the articles of the Apostles' Creed; likewise, knowledge of the Ten Commandments, and of some of the Sacraments. Other things are not so necessary that without an explicit knowledge of them and profession of Faith a man cannot be saved, provided that he has a ready will to accept and believe them, when they are properly proposed to him by the Church.

This distinction is gathered from the fact that, without the knowledge and Faith in the mysteries of the first kind mentioned, no adult is admitted to Baptism; however, without the knowledge and explicit Faith in the second kind ordinarily they are admitted. Thus, in Acts 2, after just one sermon of Peter, in which he taught the main principles of Faith in Christ, in one day three thousand men were baptized. Doubtless they knew nothing else except the necessary things, and so it is also said that after Baptism they were persevering in the teaching of the Apostles, that is, they were learning what they had not yet heard about the Christian mysteries. Thus Paul, when he considered the Thessalonians to be among the number of the Saints, and extolled their Faith and charity with glowing praises, nevertheless said in 1 Thess. 3:10: *Praying... that we may see you face to face and supply what is lacking in your faith.*

Note secondly that the Apostles were accustomed to preach to all the things that are simply necessary; but of the other things, not all to everyone, but certain things to everyone, which certainly were useful to all, but certain things only to the Elders, to Bishops and Priests, such as on how to govern the Church, administer the Sacraments, refute heretics, etc., just as also now some things are debated in the schools among the professors, and other things are explained in sermons to the people. Thus in Acts 20:17ff. the Apostle instructs the Bishops of Asia separately. Thus in 1 Cor. 2:6 he speaks about wisdom among the perfect. Thus in 2 Tim. 2:2 he said: *Entrust these things to faithful men who will be able to teach others also.* Thus Irenaeus says in book 4, chapter 43 that

the Apostles, along with the Episcopacy, handed on to their successors the charism of knowledge.

In addition to the above remarks, I say that all those things were written by the Apostles which are necessary for all, and which they openly preached to all publicly; but they did not write down everything. Therefore when Irenaeus says that the Apostles wrote what they had preached to the world, it is true, and not contrary to the Traditions, because they did not preach everything to the people, but only the things that were necessary or profitable for them, while they handed on the other things separately to the more perfect.

Secondly, he quotes Origen on Rom. 3, in his homily 25 on Matt., in homily 7 on Ezekiel, where he says that we ought not to speak about divine things in the proper sense, but confirm everything from the testimonies of Scripture. *It is necessary for us,* he said, *to invoke the Holy Scriptures in testimony. For our observations and narrations without these testimonies do not have faith.* I respond: Origen is speaking about very obscure questions, which for the most part are not those that do not have the testimony of the tradition accepted in the whole Church. For in other respects Origen says clearly in homily 5 on Numbers that many things are preserved in the Church, and necessarily must be preserved by all, since no [written] testimonies exist concerning them.

Thirdly, he calls as a witness the Emperor Constantine, who, according to Theodoretus in book 4, chapter 7, said this at the Council of Nicaea: *The Evangelical and Apostolic books, and also the oracles of the ancient Prophets clearly instruct us concerning the nature of God. Therefore, having set aside hostile disagreement, we derive the explanations of questions from the words inspired by God.* I respond that this testimony should not be made as important as Calvin and Kemnitius make it. For, Constantine was a great Emperor, but he was not a great Doctor of the Church, especially since, according to the opinion of the new heretics and the ancient Arians, Constantine at the time had not yet been baptized, and therefore he did not know the mysteries of the religion.

But granted the authority of Constantine, I say: the testimonies of all those dogmas, which pertain to the nature of God, are present in the Scriptures, and concerning those dogmas we can be fully and completely instructed from the Scriptures, if we understand them correctly; but the true sense of the Scriptures depends on the unwritten Tradition of the Church. Accordingly Theodoretus, who in book 1, chapter 7 narrated this oration of Constantine, in chapter 8 recounts that the Scriptures were quoted by both parties, for and against; and since the Arians were not convinced, because they explained the same Scriptures in a way different from the Catholics, they were condemned by the unwritten explanations, understood in a religious sense. No one ever doubted that Constantine agreed with this condemnation.

Fourthly, he cites Athanasius, who in his *Oration against the Heathen,* at the very beginning said: *For although the sacred and inspired Scriptures are sufficient to declare all the truth, etc.* I respond that the "all" was added on his own by Kemnitius, because Athanasius says only "to declare the truth." For he is speaking there not about all the dogmas, but only about two, which are the arguments of two books, which he wrote for Macarius: namely, that idols are not gods, and that Christ is true God and true man—and that these two facts have express testimonies in the Scriptures. Furthermore, Athanasius

adds in the same place that the Scriptures indeed suffice to declare the truth of these two dogmas; however, not without the explanation of the holy Fathers. But since their books are not easily accessible to all, he says that he wants to write about the things which he learned from these holy Fathers.

Fifthly, he refers to Basil in his Sermon on the confession of Faith, where he says this: *It was an argument of unfaithfulness and a certain sign of pride, if someone wants to reject something of the things that were written, or to introduce something that was not written.* And he has something similar in his Summary of Morals (72, chapter 1 and 80, chapter 22). I respond: Basil is speaking about those who add to the dogmas of Scripture something else that is contrary and foreign, and opposed to the Scriptures. For, in the same Sermon on the confession of Faith he says that, when he was arguing with heretics, he often used expressions that were not written, but were in harmony with the Scriptures; he says that the Apostle also used testimonies not only from the Scriptures, but also from the Philosophers, when they were not contrary to the Scriptures. You can add to this that Basil also speaks about those who, not being content with the written words, invent others out of their own heads. For that is a very certain sign of pride. Therefore, he is talking about the Traditions, which are made up by private individuals, not about those which the Church received from the Apostles through the succession of the Bishops.

He refers to another place in letter 80, where Basil says: *We think that it is not right that the custom which grew among them should be held for the law and canon of right doctrine. Therefore let us stand by the choice of the Scripture inspired by God.* I respond: Kemnitius omitted the words, which were in the middle and worked against him. For the question then was, whether it should be said that there are three hypostases in God, and one nature. Some were saying that this should not be said in this way, and were presenting for their argument a custom of their own region, where no one used such words. To this there is the response of Basil, who thought the contrary, that in other regions there is the custom that they say there are three hypostases in God and one nature; and so if they do not want to acquiesce to this custom, it is not right that they want their own other custom to be the rule, but both should abide by the judgment of Scripture, which no one can reject. Here therefore you can see that he is not dealing with a Tradition received in the Church, but with particular or local customs. Then Basil appealed from a custom to the Scriptures, because from the contrary customs nothing certain could be established.

Sixthly, he cites Chrysostom in homily 1 on Matt., homily 3 on 2 Thess. and homily 13 on Genesis where Chrysostom says Scripture is useful and clear in the necessary things. But why is this so? Then he cites his testimony in homily 49 on Matt. 24 where, while explaining these words, *Then let those who are in Judea flee to the mountains,* he says: during the time of heresies there is no other way to find the truth except by reading the Scriptures. But this testimony is not from Chrysostom, but from the author of an unfinished work, who either was an Arian, or certainly his work was corrupted by Arians in many places. For, in homily 48 he calls heretics "homousianos," and in homily 49 he speaks almost always against them, and so this whole passage was inserted by Arians, and it has been removed from some recently emended codices. He offers another testimony of Chrysostom from his homily on Psalm 95, towards the end: *If something*

is said without Scripture, the thinking of the hearers limps, now nodding assent, now hesitating; but when the testimony proceeds from the Scripture of the divine word, it strengthens both the word of the speaker and the mind of the hearer.

I respond: since in the immediately preceding words Chrysostom said: *For it is necessary not to say anything on one's own authority and without citing witnesses,* we should think that he (since he adds immediately: *If something is said without Scripture...)* wants to say if someone is speaking only on the basis of his own thinking. Therefore, the meaning of his words is this: that if something is said out of one's own invention, it is not so easily persuasive, as happens when what is said can be confirmed by the testimony of Scripture.

He cites another word of Chrysostom from homily 13 on 2 Cor.: *Since we have an exact balance of all things, a gnomon, and a rule—an assertion of the divine laws, I beseech all of you to relinquish what seems to be against this or that, and concerning these things to seek everything from the Scriptures.* I respond: he is not talking about dogmas of the Faith or about points of morals, but about the opinion of carnal men, who prefer earthly success to poverty, since Scripture teaches clearly that poverty is much more helpful for salvation. Therefore, Chrysostom here is saying nothing other than that one should put more trust in the Scriptures on this matter than in the opinion of men.

Finally, he cites the testimony of the same Chrysostom from his Commentary on Matt. 22: *Whatever is sought for salvation, everything is already contained in the Scriptures.* I respond: Chrysostom is talking about the remedy of vices, and he teaches that there is no vice for which some remedy cannot be found in Scripture. Basil also teaches this in his Oration on Psalm 1. But what do these things have to do with the Traditions?

Seventhly, he cites Epiphanius, who says in Heresies 61 : *We can explain the solution of any kind of question not from our own way of thinking, but from the statement of the Scriptures.* I respond: Epiphanius does not say, from the statement of the Scriptures alone; and elsewhere he says very clearly, as we showed above, that not everything can be solved from Scripture, and therefore that Tradition is necessary.

In the eighth place, he quotes Cyril, who said the following in his book on Faith: *It is necessary for us to follow the divine writings, and in nothing to depart from their precepts.* I respond: he does not say that it is not permitted to say something that is not contained in the Scriptures, but that it is not permitted to speak against the Scriptures. For this means not to depart from the precepts of the Scriptures, which we admit with pleasure; for, we have never defended Traditions opposed to Scripture.

He also cites Cyril's words from homily 5 on the book of Leviticus: *I think, that in these two days, two Testaments can be understood, in which every word that pertains to God, can be studied and discussed, and that from them all knowledge of things grasped. But if something remains over, which the divine Scripture does not resolve, that no other third Scripture should be accepted as having the authority of knowledge.* I respond first of all that those homilies on Leviticus are not by St. Cyril, but by Origen, or perhaps someone else, who passim destroys the letter, in order to fashion mystical meanings out of his own head. Therefore, those homilies do not enjoy great authority. You can add to this that there the author of the homily does not exclude the unwritten word of God, but

only a third Scripture, that is, a human Scripture which wants to recommend itself as divine.

In the ninth place, he cites Theophylus in book 2 on Easter, who says this: *It is the sign of a diabolical spirit to consider something divine that is outside the authority of the sacred Scriptures.* I respond: he is talking about apocryphal books, which by some are assumed to be divine. But it is unfitting, and I do not wish to use harsher language, to twist things from one area of concern to another.

In the tenth place, he refers to Apollinaris, who says in book 5, chapter 15 of Eusebius's History that for a long time he delayed writing against the heresy of Montanus, lest he seem to be adding something to the Evangelical word of God. I respond first that those words are not found in all the codices. Second, he is not speaking about the authority of the written Evangelical word. Third, he is thinking about the addition of a new contrary dogma; for, in the same place he accuses Montanus of not abiding by the doctrine which the Church had received from Tradition and from the succession of the Bishops from the Apostles.

In the eleventh place, he cites Tertullian, who in chapter 22 of his book *Against Hermogenes* said: *I revere the fullness of His Scripture... But whether all things were made out of any underlying Matter, I have as yet failed anywhere to find. Where such a statement is written, Hermogenes' shop must tell us. If it is nowhere written, then let it fear the woe which impends on all who add to or take away from the written word.* I respond: *Tertullian is talking about one dogma only, namely, that God created everything out of nothing, not from pre-existing matter, as Hermogenes imagined. And although this dogma is contained clearly in the Scriptures, Tertullian says that he reverences the fullness of Scripture with regard to this dogma, and then he says that Hermogenes, who added a contrary dogma to Scripture, which is repugnant to Scripture, has fallen into that abuse, whereby we are forbidden to add to or to detract from Scripture with the result that its truth is changed.*

In the twelfth place, he quotes Cyprian, who says the following in his letter to Pompey: Whence is that tradition? Does it descend from the authority of the Lord and of the Gospel, or does it come from the commands and the epistles of the Apostles? For, God testifies that those things must be done which have been written, and he proposes Jesus speaking from the boat: Let the book of this law not be absent from your mouth. Therefore, if it is either commanded in the Gospel, or is contained in the letters or deeds of the Apostles, this holy Tradition is to be observed, etc. I respond that Cyprian wrote these things when he wanted to defend his error, and therefore it is not surprising, if he reasons like those who are erring. Therefore, St. Augustine in book 5, chapter 23 and following, in his book *Against the Donatists,* refutes this letter. Moreover, although Cyprian rejected that one Tradition about Baptism, because he thought it was against the Scriptures, still he did not on that account want others to be rejected which, even though they are not in the Scriptures, nevertheless do not conflict with Scripture.

In the thirteenth place, he quotes the famous saying of Jerome on chapter 1 of the letter to Titus: *Without the authority of the Scriptures chattering would not generate Faith.* And also what he comments on Matt. 23: *What does not have authority from*

the Scriptures is rejected with the same facility with which it is affirmed. And what he says about Haggai 1: *What they ascertain and imagine on their own accord without the authority and the testimonies of the Scriptures, as it were from the Apostolic Tradition, the sword of God strikes.* Finally, there is his Commentary on Psalm 86: *The Lord will narrate in the Scriptures of the people and of the princes and of those who were in her: See,* he said, *what he says, those who were, not those who are, with the exception of the Apostles, whatever else is said afterwards, let it be cast away, for it does not have authority.*

I respond to the first quote by saying that the passage has been distorted by Kemnitius. For this is what Jerome says: *Without the authority of the Scriptures chattering would not generate faith, unless they seem to strengthen the bad doctrine with the divine testimonies.* Therefore, he does not call "chattering" what is said outside Scripture, but he says that chattering men do not find faith among any, unless they show that their errors are confirmed from the Scriptures, which is precisely what the heretics do. To the second quote I say: that also is not cited correctly: for, Jerome did not say generally what does not have the authority of the Scriptures, etc. But while speaking about a particular opinion, by which some authors relied on an apocryphal book to prove that the Zechariah, whom the Jews killed between the temple and the altar, was the Zechariah who was the father of John the Baptist, he said: *What does not have authority fi-om the Scriptures is rejected with the same facility with which it is affirmed.* And the meaning is, because this opinion is proved from an apocryphal book, not from a canonical one, it is easily refuted. To the third quote the solution is clear: for he is speaking only against those who invent something, and then want to pretend that their own imagination is an Apostolic Tradition. To the last one I say that Jerome in that place rejects those things that are foreign to the apostolic doctrine, that is, contrary to and opposed to the Scriptures.

In the last place, they cite the testimonies of Augustine. First, there is what he said in book 2, chapter 9 *On Christian Doctrine: Those things that are put openly in the Scriptures, either as precepts for living or as rules for believing are to be studied, etc.* I respond: he is speaking about the dogmas contained in the Apostles' Creed and in the Decalogue. Therefore, the same Augustine in book 2 of his treatise *On Merits and Remission of Sin* said: *This much I should still believe, that from this very circumstance the Holy Scriptures would possess a most clear authority, whenever a point arose which no man could be ignorant of, without imperiling the salvation which has been promised him.* But besides those, there are many others, which are had only by Tradition, as we showed above from many places of Augustine.

Similarly, secondly, there is what he says in book 3, chapter 6 in his *Answer to Petition:* If anyone says *concerning Christ, or concerning His Church, or any other matter whatsoever which is connected with your faith and life, to say nothing of ourselves, who are by no means to be compared with Paul who said: If an angel from heaven preach any other gospel unto you than that which you have received in the law fid and evangelical Scripture, let him be accursed.* I respond: already above we have shown from Augustine's Tractate 98 on John that the word *"praeterquam"* here means "contrary to."

Thirdly, he cites some places from book 19, chapter 18 of *The City of God,* from Tractate 2 on the letters of John, from letter 163, from chapter 14 of the book on pastors, and from book 6, chapter 5 of the *Confessions,* but in these places there is absolutely nothing against the Traditions: for, Augustine only says that the dogmas are to be proved from the Scriptures, when the testimonies of Scripture are present; and that the Scriptures are to be believed; that nothing should be said against Scripture, and similar statements, which are true; but in vain are they cited as being against the Traditions, or for the sufficiency of Scripture, because in those places Augustine in no way says any such thing.

Fourthly, he cites this from chapter 1 from his book *On the Good of Widowhood: What more can I say beyond what we read in the Apostle? For, Holy Scripture fixes the rule of our doctrine, lest we try to know more than what is necessary. Therefore it is my task to teach you nothing other than to explain for you the words of the teacher.* I respond: Augustine is talking not about all dogmas, but only about the profession of widowhood, whose good quality the Apostle had explained in 1 Cor. 7; therefore, Augustine says it is enough if he explains the words of the Apostle. But what Augustine says in a general way: *Holy Scripture fixes the rule of our doctrine, lest we try to know more than what is necessary,* is directed against those who on their own authority invent new doctrines, which are not in harmony with the Scriptures.

Fifthly, there is this in book 3, chapter 14 of his work against Maximinus . *Neither I regarding Nicaea, nor you regarding Ariminensis should quote the Council and so to pre-judge the case. You are not bound by the authority of either the former or the latter: by the authorities of the Scriptures, by the real testimonies not just of anyone but of both communities, one thing contends with another, one cause with another cause, one reason with another reason.* Likewise on Psalm 37 concerning the words, *The sinners have been banished, etc. Let them be removed from our presence, let the book of God take over: listen to Christ speaking, listen to truth talking.* Similar things are found in his book on the unity of the Church, chapters 3,6,10 and 16.

I respond: indeed it seems that in these texts something is being said against the Councils, but not against the Traditions. But we can easily show that nothing is being taught by Augustine against the Councils. For it is certain that Augustine did not want the Councils to be removed from these disputes, and only the Scriptures be accepted, because he did not believe that the authority of the legitimate Councils was very great, and this for two reasons. First, so that he could work more efficiently: for if he had wanted to take his argument from a Council, he would have had to prove first that the Councils must be accepted, which would take too long. And this reason had special importance against the Arians, who did not accept the Council of Nicaea in any way. Another reason is because for those questions, which were current at the time, there were very clear testimonies in Scripture, which without doubt were to take precedence over all the decrees of the Councils. And this reason has special efficacy against the Donatists in the question about the Church. Moreover, the same Augustine in letters 118, 162, 165, 166, and in his book on Baptism, often favorably quotes the Councils and Traditions, and also the responses of Pontiffs and Emperors.

Sixthly, he quotes this from book 2, chapter 36 of his treatise *On Merits and the*

Remission of Sin: Where there is a dispute about something obscure and there are no certain and clear documents of the divine Scriptures pertaining to it, human presumption must restrain itself, doing nothing to favor one side or the other. I respond: he is talking about very obscure questions, such as what he thought about the origin of souls; in order to define this the Scriptures do not offer any firm testimonies, but only some conjectures from the divine writings. But this has nothing to do with Traditions, which are confirmed by the consent of the whole Church and of all the Fathers. Augustine teaches passim that this argument is very serious, and especially in book 1, chapter 33 in his work against Crescon., where he says that the truth of Scripture is to be held by us, when we do what pleases the whole Church, although we read nothing written about it.

Seventhly, there is the matter in chapters 3 and 6 of his book *On Catechizing the Uninstructed,* where Augustine teaches that a brief summary of doctrine from the Scriptures should be proposed to the catechumens; when they say that they believe it and promise to observe it, he says they should be baptized. On the basis of this Kemnitius claims that what is contained in the Scriptures is sufficient for a Christian. I respond: it suffices indeed, so that someone can be baptized, but it does not suffice absolutely for the Church of God. Otherwise we could also conclude that the Apostles' Creed suffices for the Church, and everything else is superfluous.

Therefore, these are the testimonies of the Ancients cited by the heretics, and three things should be noted about them: first, there are twice as many testimonies that we cited to refute them. Second, our testimonies expressly teach the need to accept the unwritten Traditions, so that the heretics, since they cannot deny them, passim revert to blasphemies. The testimonies cited by them do not really pertain to the Traditions, but by bad logic they are twisted by the adversaries to apply to them. The last point is that the adversaries, when refuted by the evidence of the testimonies, sometimes admit that the Traditions were defended by some of the Fathers: however, we are forced to admit that the Traditions were not opposed by any of the Fathers.

CHAPTER XII

THE REASONS OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE ANSWERED

The third type of arguments coming from reason remain to be answered. Therefore, the first reason is that it seems impossible to be able to preserve unwritten Traditions, since there have always been many impediments to this—forgetfulness, ignorance, negligence, perversity, which are never lacking in the human race. Accordingly, we see the fact that the teachings of Lycurgus, Pythagoras, and others like them, who taught but did not write, completely perished.

I respond that it is not only not impossible to preserve the Traditions, but also that it is impossible that they not be preserved. For, the care of them does not depend principally on men, but on God, who rules the Church. Therefore, just as God has preserved the Church to this day in spite of so many persecution of Emperors, Philosophers, Jews, heretics, and just as he was able to preserve the Traditions from Adam until Moses in the course of two thousand years; and then the Scriptures from Moses to this time through three thousand and more years, so he can without doubt preserve the Traditions from Christ to us through 1500 years, especially since besides the providence of God, which is the principal cause, there are four other assisting causes.

The first is Scripture. For although there are not written Traditions in the divine Writings, still they are written in the monuments of the Ancients, and in the ecclesiastical books.

The second cause is the continual use. For, many Traditions are in continual observation, like the rites for the administration of the Sacraments, feast days, times of fasting, the celebration of the Mass and of the Divine Office, and other things of the same kind. Therefore, just as common languages are preserved, even if sometimes no Grammars exist, because of their continual use, like the Hebrew language, which was preserved commonly in the people of God from Adam until the Babylonian captivity through so many thousands of years, so also without any Scripture, Traditions of this kind can be preserved by their use.

The third cause is some external monuments, which last for a long time, like ancient temples, and in them altars, holy fonts, relics of the Saints, crosses, paintings, ecclesiastical books, and similar things. Baleoli in Flanders in the year 1571 told me, when I happened to come to that place, that the pastor of that place, a heretical minister, had persuaded the people that the erection of the stone altars was something recent and scarcely a hundred years old; the citizens began to demolish the altars; but when they were in the process of doing it, they found some ancient words carved into one of the altars, which stated the year in which the altar had been dedicated. From that inscription they understood that the altar had been installed much earlier, and unless I am mistaken, some centuries before the time when the heretic said the altars were made. Thus a stone monument refuted the heretic, and preserved an ecclesiastical Tradition.

The fourth cause is heresy: for God in a wonderful way uses the enemies of the Church in order to preserve the Church. Thus, in each age new heretics have appeared,

who have denied different dogmas of the Church; so also in each age there have been learned men who, in order to resist the heretics, have diligently studied the doctrine of the Church, and the ancient Traditions, and with great diligence have recommended them to posterity. For, it is like someone who possesses his goods in a peaceful way for a long time, easily may lose the documents and instruments which prove that he is their owner, and by which he rightfully possess those things; but someone who is constantly fighting carefully guards his possessions, and he does not suffer their loss for any reason.

The second argument. The divine books were written so that we can have a rule and norm of Faith and morals, as Augustine teaches in book 19, chapter 18 in *The City of God,* in book 11, chapter 5 *Against Faustus,* and the works of God are perfect. Therefore, Scripture is the perfect and adequate rule of our Faith; therefore whatever is in Scripture is of Faith; and whatever is not in Scripture is not of Faith; therefore, Scripture alone is necessaiy and sufficient to preserve the Faith.

I respond to the major proposition in two ways. First, that the real and principal purpose of Scripture is not that it be the rule of Faith, but that it should be a useful instruction to help preserve and foster the doctrine received from preaching. Here is proof that it is not the principal purpose of Scripture to be the rule of Faith. For, then it must contain all and only those things that of themselves pertain to faith, as we see was done in the Creed, which truly is said to be and is a composite so that it is a brief rule of Faith; but in the Scriptures there are many things which in themselves do not pertain to the Faith, that is, which were not written with the purpose that they must necessarily be believed, but they are believed necessarily because they were written, as is clear from all the histories in the Old Testament, and also from the many narratives of the Gospels, of the Acts of the Apostles, of the salutations of Paul in his letters, and from other writings of the same kind.

However, that many things must be believed that are not in the Scriptures has been shown abundantly above. Therefore, the main purpose of Scripture is not that it be the rule of faith, but that it help us in this pilgrimage with its various documents, examples, exhortations, now causing fear, now instructing, now warning, now consoling. For it is obvious that Scripture is not one continuous work, such as a rule of Faith should be, but it contains various works—histories, sermons, prophecies, songs, letters, etc. Paul expresses this purpose in Rom. 15:4: *Whatever was written in former days was written for our instruction, that by steadfastness and by the encouragement of the Scriptures we might have hope.* And 2 Pet. 1:13: *I think it right, as long as I am in this body, to arouse you by way of reminder.* And 2 Pet. 3:1 : *This is the second letter I have written to you, and in both of them I have aroused your sincere mind by way of reminder.*

I say, in the second place, that Scripture, although it was not made primarily to be the rule of Faith, nevertheless is a rule of Faith, not totally but partially. For the total rule of Faith is the word of God, that is, the revelation of God made to the Church, which is divided into two partial rules—Scripture and Tradition. Indeed because Scripture is a rule, it follows that whatever it contains is necessarily true and must be believed, and whatever it opposed to it is necessarily false and to be repudiated. But because it is not the total rule, but only partial, from that it follows that it does not measure all things, and

therefore there are some things pertaining to Faith that are not contained in it. And this is the way in which the words of St. Augustine should be understood: for, nowhere does he say that Scripture is the only rule, but he does say that Scripture is a rule; in reference to it the writings of the ancient Fathers must be examined, so that we can accept those things that are in harmony with Scripture, and reject the things that are opposed to Scripture.

They take the third argument from the disadvantage that the Traditions bring with themselves. For if this door is opened, so that we can say that some dogmas must be accepted which cannot be proved by any testimony of Scripture, occasion will be given for many to invent and introduce into the Church many false things under the guise of Tradition. For, we know that formerly some very holy men were deceived in this way. Thus Papias was induced from Tradition to teach a future Kingdom of Christ here on earth for a thousand years after the resurrection; others who put faith in this were Irenaeus, Tertullian, Lactantius, and many others. On this, see Eusebius in book 3, chapter 39 of his History. Moreover, Irenaeus in book 2, chapters 39 and 40 teaches from Tradition that Christ in about the fiftieth year of his life suffered his passion. But contrary to this, Tertullian in chapter 5 of his book against the Jews, and Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of the *Stromata* teach that Christ was thirty years old when he suffered, and all of these Traditions are false.

I respond first: if this argument had any value, then not only the Traditions but also the Scriptures would have to be rejected. For, many false and pernicious books were adorned formerly with the title of canonical books of Peter, Paul, Bartholomew and the other Apostles, as is clear from Gelasius in the Council of 70 Bishops, from Jerome in his book *On Illustrious Men* (in the essay on St. Luke). Therefore St. Paul says in 2 Thess. 2:2: *Do not be excited either by word or by letter purporting to be from us.* That is, because false apostles were promulgating both oral sermons and written letters pretending to be from the true Apostles. Furthermore, Papias derived his error about the thousand years not so much from the unwritten Tradition as from the badly understood Scriptures of the Gospels and the book of Revelation, as Jerome says in his commentary on Isa. 19 and Matt. 19. Irenaeus also tries to prove from Tradition and from Scripture that Jesus lived to be almost fifty. For, he proves it from this text in John 8:57: *You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?* Finally, Tertullian and Clement of Alexandria try to prove their error on the basis of only one Scripture badly understood. Therefore Kemnitius in vain and rashly cites these texts against the Traditions.

I say secondly that that disadvantage, which is common to Traditions and Scriptures, is no big obstacle either to true Traditions or to true Scriptures. For in the Church there is an authority, and also a certain way and guide in order to distinguish the true Traditions and Scriptures from the false; and a truly apocryphal book has never been accepted by the public judgment of the Church for a canonical one, nor a false Tradition for a true one.

The fourth argument. It is characteristic of the heretics to conceal their dogmas and to say that Christ and the Apostles preached some things openly to all, but that he handed on other things only secretly to a few. Thus Irenaeus in book 1, chapter 23 writes about the Basilidians that they say that it is not necessary to proclaim their mysteries, but to keep them out of sight by their silence. And in chapter 24 he said about the Carpocratians:

They declare that they are no longer Jews, and that they are not yet Christians; and that it is not at all fitting to speak openly of their mysteries, but right to keep them secret by preserving silence. Tertullian also in his book on prescription said: *They usually say that the Apostles did not know everything; or indeed that they did know everything, but that they did not hand on everything to all.*

I respond that the heretics are monkey Christians, as Cyprian teaches in his letter to Jubajan., and that they want to have their own mysteries. But there is an important difference between their mysteries and ours, since they want their mysteries to be secret because they are shameful, as is clear from the Gnostics themselves, who confected the Eucharist out of the semen of a man and the menstruation of women, as Epiphanius reports; Augustine also says this about Manicheans in chapter 46 of his book *On the Morals of the Manicheans;* and it is certain that there are similar mysteries of the Anabaptists. It is also certain that they want them to be kept secret from learned men, and to be manifested only to the ignorant. Accordingly, Irenaeus and Tertullian blame the old heretics because they said that Christ did not hand on those mysteries to the Apostles, nor the Apostles to the Bishops who succeeded them, and I know not to which others.

Our mysteries are not handed on only to certain persons, because they fear the light, but either because it is not necessary that they be known by all, or because all are not capable of understanding them. Moreover, they are such that they can be preached in public; for the Church does nothing except what is pure and chaste. And I think this is what the Lord meant, when he said in Matt. 10:27: *What you hear whispered, proclaim upon the housetops,* that is, if it is necessary. And then there is what he says in John 18:20: *I have spoken openly to the world; I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come together; I have said nothing secretly;* that is, I have said nothing that cannot be said everywhere, which pertains to the truth and purity of his teachings; but this is not opposed to the fact that he explained some things to his disciples separately.

The end of the first general Controversy

LAUS DEO, VIRGINIQUE MATRI MARIE

THE SECOND GENERAL CONTROVERSY

ON CHRIST THE HEAD

OF THE WHOLE CHURCH

EXPLAINED IN FIVE BOOKS

THE SECOND GENERAL CONTROVERSY
ON CHRIST THE HEAD
OF THE WHOLE CHURCH

EXPLAINED IN FIVE BOOKS

INDEX OF THE BOOKS AND CHAPTERS OF THE SECOND CONTROVERSY

BOOK ONE

ON THE TRUE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

Preface on the two kinds of enemies of Christ 274

I. The opinion of the new Samosatenians is explained 284
II. The opinion of the new Arians is explained 285
III. It is demonstrated from Scripture and the Fathers that there is only one God. 287
IV. The divinity of the Son of God is asserted. The first class of arguments from both Testaments 293
V. The second class from the Old Testament 299
VI. The third class from the New Testament 305
VII. The fourth class from the names of the true God 323
VIII. The fifth class from the attributes 327
IX. The sixth class from the works 333
X. The seventh class from the Fathers 339
XI. The eighth class by the Sibyls 355
XII. The ninth class from the divine testimonies of visions and miracles 356
XIII. The divinity of the Holy Spirit is demonstrated 359
XIV. The first argument of the heretics is answered 364
XV. The second argument is answered 367
XVI. The third argument is answered 368
XVII. The fourth argument is answered 371
XVIII. The fifth argument is answered 373
XIX. The sixth argument is answered 376
XX. Objections against the divinity of the Holy Spirit are answered 377

BOOK TWO

ON THE PERSONAL DISTINCTION FROM THE FATHER AND THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

I. On the distinction of the persons in the same essence..... 379
II. On the words which we use in explaining this mystery..... 380
HI. On the words Essence and Homousion..... 381
IV. On the words Hypostasis and Substance..... 384
V. On the other words..... 388
VI. The distinction of Persons is shown..... 391
VIL The first argument against the distinction of persons in the same essence is refuted..... 396
VIII. The second argument is refuted..... 398
K. The third argument is refuted..... 400
X. The fourth argument is refuted..... 402
XI. The fifth argument is refuted..... 403
XIL The sixth argument is refuted..... 405
XIII. The seventh argument is refuted..... 406
XIV. The eighth argument is refuted..... 407
XV. The ninth argument is refuted..... 409
XVI. The tenth argument is refuted..... 413
XVII. The eleventh argument is refuted..... 414
XVIII. The twelfth argument is refuted..... 415
XIX. Whether the Son of God is self-God (autotheos)..... 417
XX. On the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son..... 421
XXL On the origin of the heresy that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son 422
XXII. It is shown from the Scriptures that the Spirit proceeds from the Son..... 425
XXIII. The same point is proved from the testimonies of the Councils..... 429
XXIV. The same point is proved from the Latin Fathers..... 431
XXV. The same point is proved from the Greek Fathers..... 434
XXVI. The same point is confirmed by reason..... 443
XXVII. The arguments of the Greeks are answered..... 447
XXVIII. It is demonstrated that the addition of the Filoque was made correctly..... 451
XXIX. The objections of the Greeks are answered..... 454
XXX. The argument is concluded with the divine testimony..... 457

BOOK THREE

ON THE TRUTH AND MAJESTY OF THE FLESH OF CHRIST OR THE INCARNATION

I. On the contemporary errors concerning the Incarnation..... 458

II. The heresy of Eutyches is explained.....464

III. The heresy of Eucyches is refuted.....466

IV. The arguments are answered, which were made formerly against what was demonstrated in the previous chapter... 469

V. The heresy of Nestorius is explained..... 471

VI. The heresy of Nestorius is refuted.....473

VII. The arguments of the adversaries are refuted..... 479

VIII. The arguments of the adversaries are refuted..... 482

IX. A question is proposed: whether a real communication of the divine attributes follows from the hypostatic union, and especially Immensity or Ubiquity..... 489

X. The real communication of idioms with respect to the natures does not flow from the hypostatic union..... 491

XI. The Ubiquity of the humanity of Christ is refuted, because it contradicts the Scriptures..... 494

XII. The Ubiquity of the body of Christ is refuted, because it contradicts the Apostles' Creed.....497

XIII. Ubiquity is refuted, because it is opposed to the presence of the body of Lord in the Eucharist..... 502

XIV. Ubiquity is refuted by the testimonies of the Fathers..... 504

XV. The argument of the heretics is answered..... 506

XVI. Other objections taken from the word of God are answered..... 509

XVII. The argument taken from the Incarnation is answered.....513

XVIII. The argument taken from the testimonies of the Fathers is answered.....514

XIX. The aigument based on the teaching of the scholastics is answered..... 517

XX. The last objection based on natural reasons is answered..... 519

BOOK FOUR

ON THE SOUL OF CHRIST AND HIS DESCENT INTO THE UNDERWORLD

I. The first controversy on the knowledge of the soul of Christ is proposed..... 520
II. The truth is proved from the Scriptures..... 522
III. The same point is proved from the teaching of the Fathers..... 524
IV. The same point is proved from reason..... 526
V. The arguments of the adversaries are answered..... 527
VI. The second question is proposed, which is about the descent into the underworld.. 532
VII. To descend into the underworld is not to be completely annihilated..... 533
VIII. Christ did not suffer the pains of the damned..... 535
IX. There is a third error about Christ's descent into the underworld that must be refuted..... 544
X. The underworld is a place distinct from sepulchers..... 545
XI. The souls of the pious were not in heaven before the ascension of Christ..... 548
XII. It is shown from the Scriptures that Christ really descended into the underworld.. 550
XIII. The explanation of a very obscure place in 1 Peter 3 and 4..... 553
XIV. The tradition of the Fathers on the descent of Christ into the underworld..... 558
XV. Christ personally and really descended into the underworld..... 562
XVI. Some doubts are resolved..... 566

BOOK FIVE

ON THE OFFICE AND MERIT OF THE MEDIATOR

I. It is explained briefly according to which nature Christ is Mediator..... 570
II. The error of Stancarus on the Mediator is refuted..... 572
III. The errors of the Calvinists and Lutherans concerning the Mediator are refuted from the Scriptures..... 575
IV. The same error is refuted from the Fathers..... 577
V. The same error is refuted with reasons..... 579
VI. The arguments of adversaries taken from the Scriptures are answered..... 583
VII. The testimonies of the Fathers, which the adversaries cite, are explained..... 585
VIII. Arguments taken from reason are answered..... 587
IX. It is shown that Christ also merited something for himself..... 590
X. Calvin's arguments are refuted..... 592

BOOK ONE

On the true divinity of Christ

PREFACE

ON THE TWO KINDS OF ENEMIES OF THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST

Since I am about to defend the universal Church, which is on earth, in purgatory, and in heaven, I have decided to begin with Christ, the supreme Head and King of the whole Church. The order of the things to be treated seems to demand this, although I am not ignorant of the fact that I am taking my beginning from matter that is the gravest and most difficult of all. For, to omit the excellence and magnitude of the matter itself, which must now be treated, and which so excels all other things which we are then going to treat, just as the splendor and amplitude of the Catholic Church is surpassed by the immense light and majesty of the divine reality: certainly a class of enemies so varied and numerous opposes us in this dispute, that the remaining adversaries seem in no way to be able to be compared with them. If indeed in other controversies, it is like war declared on both sides, we will always have certain enemies, and we, fighting in the front line of battle, will carry the banner of our own Leader.

Now in this great controversy, which is instituted about Christ himself, in the future we will be dealing with two armies, one of which consists of those who manifest that they are enemies and adversaries and give certain signs that they are waging open war against us; the other is much larger, and is composed of traitors and spies; they are supplied partly with signs and false names within our camps and are against us; partly their treachery remains hidden, so that in the heat of battle they surround us and attack us from behind and from our sides.

And since it pertains not just a little bit to detect betrayal, to uncover hiding places, to know the difference between enemies and friends, and finally to have clear knowledge of the strength of all enemies, I thought it worth the effort, before we come to the actual battle, to examine the camps of the enemies, to recognize the names of the principal Leaders; and if it could be done, to reject all of those who are in the camp with us, but really are in league with our adversaries, so that they seem to shoot arrows at the enemies and in the meantime strike us, and with great skill, which they assumed for us, they turn the same arms against us.

Let us begin, therefore, if it seems good, with those who are opposed to the Divinity and Majesty of Christ our Emperor, and by an unhappy error think that they cannot arrive at the glory of the one Father, as Augustine says very well, except by the contumely of his only Son. In these camps there are two battle lines, which are like their two principal horns.

The Leader and Emperor of the first battle line is the Spaniard, Michael Servetus. When he was a wild and bold youth and heard, in the schools of the Lutherans, which he attended, that his identity is to be found, that the word of God is not in the explanations of the Fathers or of the Church, but from the testimony of the spirit alone, he began to talk about the spirit, and being urged by the spirit, he began to wonder why the Lutherans contended so much with the Papists about the Church and the Sacraments, and had not quarreled about Christ himself, and why they disagreed so much about the body, but agreed regarding the head. Therefore, thinking he would do greater things, and fearing lest his youth would be no small obstacle in gaining faith in himself, since he was only twenty-five years old and seemed to be lacking maturity, he compensated for that by assuming the authority and dignity of a prophet.

Therefore filled with great abundance of a foul spirit, he called himself the greatest prophet in the world, and we have the testimony of Calvin for this in book 4, chapter 16 of his Institutes. Hence, having assumed prophetic freedom, he poured forth those books with the same driving spirit, and he gave them the title "On the Errors of the Trinity." The main thesis of these books is that there is no distinction of persons in God, and that Christ is called the Son of God because his flesh was conceived in the womb of the Virgin and formed out of the substance of God himself. Thus, with a few words he destroyed the Trinity of the persons with Sabellius; he mixed together the natures of Christ and took away the Incarnation with Eutyches.

But if someone asks about the end of this, he will find such a one for Servetus as his impiety and wickedness demanded. For, in the middle of the city of Geneva, having been cast into the fire, he endured his suffering not with constancy and alacrity, as formerly the holy martyrs usually did, but with such a reluctant and impatient mind, that, according to the testimony of Calvin himself, who wrote the history of his death, with loud shouts, or, as he himself says, with great crying he begged to be killed by a sword. But since he had fallen into the hands of inexorable judges, after long and severe suffering he finally died in the year 1555.

Georgius Blandrata, Paul Alciatus, Lelius Socinus, Francis David, and all that rabble of ministers, followed this leader and chief. They have now established the seat of their error in Transylvania, and they have taken for themselves the title of the Consenting Churches. Indeed, with public debates and printed books impudently they have dared to condemn all the ancient Fathers, and all the old Councils, and the whole world, which for 1580 years believed in three persons in God and the two natures of Christ, to damn for Tritheism, to accuse of sophistries, and to reject as the Antichrist.

Another commander of the battle line is the Italian, Valentinus Gentilis. At first, by the study of new ideas he came from his fatherland to Geneva to see Calvin. He came primarily, as he said, because he was motivated by the fame of Calvin's erudition, but he did not allow himself for a long time to be numbered among his disciples and hearers. For, since he was full of the spirit, and like Servetus could not accept that the reformation churches still agreed with the Papists regarding faith in the Trinity, and still could not be said to be a disciple of Servetus nor could he subject his spirit to that of Servetus, he came up with a new opinion, which did not agree with Servetus, but still departed completely

from the Catholic position.

Therefore he said that there is a true Trinity in God not only of Persons but also of natures, so that there are three divine and eternal Spirits, differing essentially from each other. This opinion is said to have been that at one time of Philoponus, if the things are true, which Suldas and Nicephorus wrote about his errors. Therefore, Valentinus threw this first stone, but when he realized that the trinity of gods could not be defended from the divine writings in any way, since nothing in Scripture is more frequently said repeated than that there is only one God, outside whom, beside whom, before whom, after whom and with whom there is absolutely no other God, having changed his opinion, gradually he fell into Arianism. For, as can be known from his various confessions and statements, which are available, he said that it is proper to God the Father that he be called the one and only God, and that he alone is that greatest and highest God, which the sacred books passim preach to us. And he said that this same only Father is the true essence and nature of the Divinity, so that the Son and the Holy Spirit are not the divine essence, but offspring of the essence, an offspring greatly inferior to that essence, and, as he says, defined and limited by the manner of the generation or propagation.

Since therefore in Geneva, having been moved by an insane spirit, he was busy restoring Arianism, in the meantime Calvin was moved by another spirit to oppose Valentinus, and so these demons were in conflict with each other. Valentinus was guilty of heresy before the tribunal of the heretical Magistrate. Hence Valentinus, fearing the severity of Calvin, and remembering the terrifying fire whereby in the same city, by the same Calvin, Severus had perished a short time before, in order to gain time he pretended to admit his error. Therefore, by the sentence of the judges he was condemned to a public penance. Having taken off his clothes, with the exception of underwear, with bare feet, with a bear head and carrying in his hand a flaming torch, with a herald preceding him, he went through the whole city. Then on his knees he begged for pardon from the Magistrate, he threw his own book into the fire, and while swearing he promised that he would not leave Geneva, unless he had first asked for permission from the Magistrate.

But that famous Arian Apostle, after he had adorned his renewed Arianism with such outstanding inconstancy, wanted to adorn the same with perjury. Hence, he fled from Geneva secretly, and when he had attempted to spread his Arianism among the French, Swiss, Poles, and other peoples, he added to his first perjury a second and a third. Finally, in the eleventh year after the death of Servetus he was seized by the Zwinglians in Beme, Switzerland. Having been condemned to death, he paid the price of his boldness. While he was detained in prison in chains, he claimed that he was the first martyr of his sect, and he said that the other martyrs died for the glory of Christ, but that he was the first of all to die for the glory of God the Father. Nevertheless, when he received the news of his death, he was exceedingly terrified and turned very pale, so that he sought eveiy possible way of avoiding this punishment, being prepared also to reject his own teaching, if he could in this way change the minds of the judges. There are public records in Geneva about the case of Valentinus, and the whole history of his punishment was written by a pastor in Beme. From them we collected the few details mentioned here.

Also, a more happy ending was not obtained by Gentilis Symistae, and his colleagues

Matthew Gribaldus, the Franciscan Lismaninus, and others, about whom Theodore Beza has much to say in the Preface of Calvin's book against Gentilis. For, Gribaldus was infected by the plague and, having been abandoned by all, he died like a dog. Lismaninus, the apostate Franciscan, cast himself into a well. Franciscus David, bound with chains, became insane and departed from this life. A man called Jacob Palaeologus, who by a singular grace of God in 1583 was in the city of Rome, and after many debates and discussions finally regained his sanity, having publicly renounced all of his errors, he was reconciled with the Church. The remaining Arians of the same persuasion met the same shameful death and perished unhappily.

Furthermore, this group of men renewed their Arianism, or the even worse Paulianism, so openly, so freely, so boldly, so shamelessly that Gentilis himself did not hesitate to call the Trinity of the three persons the new idol, the tower of Babel, an imaginary and philosophical God. Gregorius Paulus said that the one essence of God, or one God in three persons, is a trick of Satan. Michael Servetus (which the mind certainly shudders to think about) called the Holy Trinity the three-headed dog Cerberus and Geryones with three bodies. Georgius Niger said that the Athanasian Creed should be called the Creed of Satan. In a public discussion held at Pericovia, Polish ministers rejected the Council of Nicaea; they repudiated Athanasius, Augustine and other Catholic Fathers; they censured Constantine, Gratian, Theodosius, who were pious Emperors; on the other hand, they said that they grieved because of the case of the disciples of Arius condemned at the same Council, and then they greatly praised both Arius himself and his disciples and the Emperor Constantius who supported the Arians. Finally, Francis David (as is known from the letter of Blandrata to condemn the judgment of the Polish Churches) went so far as to say that the Gospel should be buried, and that it is necessary to return to Moses, to the Law and to circumcision: that Moses and the teaching of Moses is the right way to go, but that Christ Jesus and his teaching is the wrong way. And he wanted his faith to be proclaimed to the whole world not only by word of mouth and by books, but also by painted pictures.

For recently a picture was produced by their workshop in which the Catholic Church is seen depicted like large building, on whose roof Luther is sitting together with his own, and he is throwing away the tiles and bricks. Then when the roof is no longer there, Zwingli with his cohort of Sacramentarians begins to demolish the walls with great force. But to destroy the foundation and so to destroy the building completely, the Tritheists and the new Arians, equipped with hammers, hoes and every kind of tools, set to work with great diligence, having forgotten the evangelical and true word of Christ: *And on this rock I will built my Church, and the gates of hell will not prevail against it.* But now enough has been said, lest I am mistaken, about the first groups of enemies.

Let us move on to the later ones. I am about to say something great and almost incredible, but I do not want to gain confidence in myself before I have made the whole matter clearer than the light of the sun. At this time on all sides Lutherans, Melanchthonites, Zwinglians, Calvinists are rising up against the Tritheists. Throughout all of Germany, France and Poland books are being published against Servetus, against Gentilis, against Blandrata, against Gregorius Paulus, against the ministers in Poland and Hungary, either Arians or Samosatenians. They are destroying this new doctrine with the weapons of their

books as a clear sign in the midst of their plans. From Geneva there are Calvin and Beza; from Wittenberg Philip Melanchthon; from Tiguro Simlerus and Bullingeus; from Beme Benedict Arelius; from Leipzig Alexander Alesius; from Marburg Andreas Hyperius; from Poland Stanislaus Samitius; from Hungary Peter Melius. From other places there are John Wigandus, Jacob Scheckius, Francis Stancarus, and who else? And all of these agree with the Papists about the Trinity, honor the first six Councils, accept the ancient Fathers with honor, and they say that they detest Sabellius, Samosatenus, Arius, Nestorius, Eutyches and all the heretics. Therefore who will not be amazed if I can demonstrate that both those, and these whom they themselves hold in high regard as teachers and as prophets, namely Erasmus and Luther, are either Arians or Sabellians or Nestorians or Eutychians?

Let us begin with Erasmus, whom the Hungarian ministers, in the book they dedicated to King John in 1567, named as the precursor, not without good reason, of their Prophet Servetus. Therefore, Erasmus, in the scholiums of Volume III of the letters of St. Jerome, says that the Arians did not teach heresy so much, but made a heresy, since they were almost equal to us in number, but superior to us in eloquence and doctrine. Behold the famous defender of Arians, who excuses them of heresy and says they are more learned than Catholics. What still remained but for him to say except that the Arians are Catholics, and Catholics heretics? But let us move on to other things. In the Preface to the books of Hilary: *We dare* (Erasmus said) *to call the Holy Spirit God, which the Ancients did not dare to do.* O what an incredible lie! Did not Hilary himself, towards the end of his book on the Trinity, deny that the Holy Spirit is something created? And if he is not something created, what else, I ask, is he but God? Did not Athanasius in his dispute with Arius, Basil in chapter 16 of his book on the Holy Spirit, Nazianzen in his oration on Herones, Didymus in his first work on the Holy Spirit, Ambrose in book 3, chapter 2 on the Holy Spirit, Augustine in book 1 against Maximinus, Nyssa in his book that the Holy Spirit is God, and all the other Fathers, both very clearly and frequently say that the Holy Spirit is God? But let us consider some other things.

Erasmus comments on Rom. 9:5: *From their race is Christ according to the flesh, who is over all God blessed forever.* It is amazing what Erasmus does not do, where he does not direct himself, in order to wrench this weapon our of our hands. First, he wants this word *(God)* to be seen as an interpolation. Then he says that this place is not strong enough to refute the Arians. Finally, he says that it can be explained in such a way that after the words: *From their race is Christ according to the flesh,* a period should be added. And that is followed by the thanksgiving, *God who is over all,* namely the Father, *be blessed forever.* Could he more obviously take up the defense of the Arian cause?

He comments on these words of Eph. 5:5: *In the kingdom of Christ and of God. But,* he said, *we have given this warning elsewhere that the Father is signified in the usual wording of the Apostle as often as God is named absolutely.* But this comment is both very favorable to the Arians and manifestly false. For certainly, and for now I omit to cite other places, in Acts 20:28 when Paul says: *Take care of the Church of God, which he obtained by his own blood,* he calls not the Father, but the Son God in the absolute sense.

Likewise there is his comment on Phil. 2:5: *He did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped.* First of all, with the Arian Maximinus he explains, *He did not usurp for*

himself equality with God. Then he adds: *I know that great authors, like Hilary, Augustine, not to mention others, have so interpreted "He did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped"; for, what he was by nature, could not be something to be grasped, since he was in the form of God. And they have this special club with which the Arians are subdued, who say that only the Father truly is God. But if it is right to act truthfully, what important thing does Paul attribute to Christ, if since he is God by nature, he understands that it is not something to be grasped, that is, that he knows himself? But this is certain, that nowhere is there greater force in the Holy Scripture than when dealing with heretics that we do not distort anything to obtain victory, even if I do not see what this text really offers against the Arians.* I ask you this, Erasmus, if you have accepted pay from the Arians, will you be able diligently to promote their cause? You reject the Catholic explanation of Augustine and you embrace the Arian explanation of Maximinus. You do not deny that this text is a main weapon of Catholics against Arius, and nevertheless you say that this weapon is worthless. Therefore what remains for you to say but that the cause of the Arians is better than that of the Catholics? What if we add this comment of yours to another one, which you made to the last chapter of the first letter of St. John? In that place did you not contend with all your strength that the words of the Lord: *I and the Father are one,* and that of the disciple: *And these three are one,* that they should be understood with the Arians to be not about the unity of nature, as all the Fathers said, but to be about the bond of charity? And in the works of St. Augustine on the margin of the first book against Maximinus, where one and the same nature of God is asserted, who added that note, *not one in number,* but Erasmus? And what did the Tritheists ever say that was clearer than that?

But let us set aside Erasmus and come to Luther. Thus, Martin Luther when writing against Jacob Latomus said: *My soul hates this word* ὁμοουσιος What, I ask you, what other than that would Arius ever think or say, if he now existed outside of hell? For, that whole tragedy, which miserably vexed and devastated the Church for so many years, was caused by this one word. Since the Catholic Fathers attempted nothing else in their books and Councils except to stabilize this principle, which teaches that Christ is homousion with the Father, the heretics, on the contrary, with their ten little councils, with fire and sword, with weapons and armies strove to accomplish nothing other than to abolish this same word.

But let us listen to the unheard of calumny and lie of the same Luther. In the same book against Lotumus he says that this very word displeased St. Jerome, because he thought some kind of poison was hidden in the syllables. And we think this did not happen to Luther through thoughtlessness or a slip of the pen, because he repeats it in his book on the Councils in these words: *St. Jerome being very upset wrote a mournful letter to the Roman Bishop Damasus, and wanted the word* ὁμοουσιος *to be expunged.* What shall we do with these men who seek only to defend their own cause with deceptions and lies? For St. Jerome, in the place cited by Luther, which is in his first letter to Damasus on the hyposteses, said that poison lies hidden in the word "hypostasis," not in the word "homousios"; he said the word is ambiguous and can signify both "person" and "substance." The word "homousios" is so far from being displeasing to St. Jerome, that rather with the fear alone, lest the word be snatched from us by the Arians, he was

afraid to say "three hyposteses." Therefore he concludes the whole letter with these words: *I implore your beatitude through the crucified salvation of the world, through the homousion Trinity that authority be given to me through your letters either to be silent about the hyposteses or to speak about them.*

What does this mean, that not only the word "homousios," but also the Trinity displeased Luther, and he removed from the German prayer books the formula of prayer *Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us?*

What does this mean, that Luther not only greatly favored not only Arius, but also Nestorius and Eutyches? For, in the great Postillis, in his sermon on the birth of the Lord, he says that some ignorant men make the man Christ omnipotent. But what is the difference—that the man Christ is not omnipotent, or that the man Christ is not God, but that there are two persons in Christ, as formerly the impious heresiarch Nestorius preached? But in part 2 of his book on the Councils he said: *Shortly before there was any contact with the Nestorians they argued against me obstinately that the divinity of Christ could not suffer.* And after that he said: *It is necessary to be said that this man Christ, this flesh and blood created the heavens and the earth.* Certainly the names of "divinity" and "flesh" are the names of natures, not of persons; therefore if for Luther the divinity suffers, if flesh created the heavens and the earth, who does not see that by Luther the natures of Christ have been confused, just as Eutyches did?

And in order that we might see more clearly the inclination of Luther's mind towards these two famous heresiarchs, in the very same book on the Councils he says Nestorius and Eutyches fell only because of a certain ignorance and in their way of speaking. For, in other respects he attributes to both of them a healthy zeal, a sincere mind and right faith. It concerns the whole cause of the disturbance and of the tragedies at that time stirred up in the Catholic Bishops, namely Leo and Cyril, and finally it went so far that he said he feared lest at the last judgment some heretics would sit there as judges, and the Bishops, who had condemned them in the Councils, would be lost forever. But he did not say openly that Nestorius and Eutyches would be future judges with Christ and that Cyril and Leo would be lost forever. I do not have time to discount these portents, nor is it necessary, since they per se make themselves known with sufficient clarity. I will add just one thing: if Nestorius had such healthy zeal and such a sincere mind, why, as Evagrius reports in book 1, chapter 7 of his History, while Nestorius was still living, did the worms sent by God gnaw away at his whole tongue in such a horrible way?

Let us move on to Melanchthon. Philip Melanchthon in the common places in the year 39 on page 8 said: *It is necessary that there be something of the divine nature in the Son.* And again on page 10: *It is necessary that there be some divine nature in Christ.* And in places of the year 45 on page 35 he wrote these words about the Holy Spirit: *God bears witness through Joel that created activity is not to be sent, but something of the essence of God. But it is necessary that the person be distinct which is something of God, and nevertheless it is not the Father.* For Philip, therefore, either there are many divine natures, and the new Tritheists have what they want, or certainly there are many parts of the divine nature, which is an ancient heresy considerably more absurd than the Arian. Concerning this Augustine long ago said this in chapter 74 of his book on the heresies:

There is an old heresy which asserts that God is threefold in such a way that one part of him is the Father, another part is the Son, and the third part is the Holy Spirit. Then in this same place in the year 45 the same Philip said: *The divine nature was not lacerated or dead, but it was obedient to the Father, it quieted and calmed the wrath of the eternal Father.* What could be said clearer in favor of the Arian heresy? For, if the divine nature of the Son was obedient to the Father, certainly there is not one nature of the Father and the Son, nor is God the Son equal to God the Father. The new Arians could not hear anything more pleasing to them than this opinion.

But now, if you please, let us consider Calvin. He, therefore, in the book against Gentilis, in the refutation of the tenth thesis, does not hesitate to concede to Valentinus the name of God κατα υπεροχήν, that is, because of a certain excellence to be attributed to the Father alone. But if the Father is God because of his excellence, how is he not greater than the Son? Again, he asserts in the same place that the opinion of Gentilis is not contrary to the truth, namely, that God had the power of generating the Son, and of producing the Holy Spirit because he willed to do it. But that God willed to generate the Son is not said absurdly; but that he generated him because he willed it, and what is more absurd, that he had the power of generating because he willed ίζ now I ask you, what sane person would say that? It is as if God generated his Son because he willed to do it, and therefore did not generate him necessarily. Therefore, the Son is not equal to the Father. For, by what reason could it happen that someone, who could not exist, is equal to one who exists always and necessarily?

What are we to say to the fact that in the same book the same Calvin says that the Son, with regard to his person, only in an improper sense is said to be the creator of heaven and earth, but that the Father is said to be such properly? What else is this, but to reduce the Son to the order of created things? Is this to defend, or to betray the cause of the Faith? To defend it or to reject it? To refute the heretic, or to laugh and play with him? What about this, that in the same place he says that this expression in the Nicene Creed is improper and difficult: *God from God, light from light?* Long ago Athanasius with these words reprimanded this view, as found in the works of St. Vigilius against Arius: *The Son in the proper sense is God from God, light from light.* Indeed in book 2, chapter 14 of the Institutes are the words of the Apostle Paul: Then also the Son himself will be subject to him who subjects all things to himself: he contends that they refer to both natures of the Son, namely, the divine and the human. And he could not or did not want to mention that the divine nature of the Son cannot be understood as subject to God the Father without being a nature distinct from the Father, and in fact is greatly inferior to it and so is understood to be a created thing. In addition, Calvin explained in a heretical way many texts of the Scriptures, and especially this one: *The Father and I are one,* in such a way that the new Samosatians in a public debate on the meaning of this text called Calvin the judge. Many things remain to be said, but I want to keep this short; therefore I will just mention the errors of others and I will not now explain them.

Hemy Bullingerus, Zwingli's successor, was not ashamed to write in his book on Scripture and the authority of the Church that in God there are three persons—different not in state, but in grade; not in subsistence, but in form; not in power, but in species. Certainly even the Arians scarcely dared to say that the divine persons are different in grade, form and species.

Indeed Peter Melius, the one who debated publicly for ten whole days in Transylvania for the Lutherans against Blandrata and Francis David, in the eighth debate said this: *Scripture distinguishes the Son of God from the Son of man.* And again he said: *The Son who is equal to the Father is distinguished from the one who is not equal.*

Theodore Beza seem to have confirmed this same thing, both against Brentius on the omnipotence of the flesh of Christ, and also against Andreas Jacobi on the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ. There he teaches openly that there are in Christ two hypostatic unions—one of the flesh with the soul, the other of God with man. What else is this but to recall Nestorius long ago buried in hell?

Stanislaus Sarnicius, whom Calvin in his letters to the Poles greatly praises, when he was involved in a public debate, openly said and also commanded to be written that only the divine nature of Christ is a Pontiff and Priest, but the human is a victim and sacrifice; and therefore by reason of his office, that the Son is less than the Father, even in the divine nature. But these words can be read in the works of St. Augustine in sermon 33 on the Arian Proposition. Surely in this way the Calvinists, when they say that they oppose the new Arians, beautifully imitate the words and ideas of the old Arians.

Jacob Scheckius Brentianus in a book against the Tritheists defends the faith so strongly that finally he does not want it to be said that there are three hypostases in God, but only one with three powers. But this is not to vanquish the Arians, but to be conquered and defeated by the Sabellians.

John Wigandus in a book against the new Arians approves the view of Luther, and defends the thesis that the essence in God generates and is generated. However, from this opinion, whether Wigandus wills it or not, the result is that there is one nature of the Father and another of the Son, since nothing can generate itself and nothing can be generated from itself.

Now what shall I say about Brentius, Schmidelinus, Kemnitius and the others who, when they confer on the flesh of Christ omnipotence, omnipresence and the all the divine attributes, doubtless confuse it with the divinity. Likewise, what about Stancarus and his followers, who refer the office of Mediator to the man Christ only in such a way that they distinguish two persons in Christ, and seem to want to join the camp of Nestorius?

That being the case, you can see, I believe, dear Reader, that Servetus, Gentilis, Blandrata, and the others who openly profess that they follow and defend them, at this time agree no less with Sabellius, Arius, Nestorius and Eutyches, than Erasmus, Luther, Philippus, Calvin, Bullingerum, Martyres, Brentius, Beza, Sarnicius, Scheckius, Wigandus, and all the others who shout that they hate and detest them. But if they truly and from the heart cursed them, they could not also not curse themselves and their own doctrine, since surely they cannot deny that they not only have given them the occasion of joining the camp of the Arians, but have also opened wide the door.

For what answer, I ask, do the Lutherans and Calvinists give, if the Tritheists put these questions to them: Why are you parents so annoyed at us your children? Why do you pursue with fire and sword those to whom you have given birth? Why do you gather the fruits of your Gospel with such a hostile spirit? Certainly none of them are from the Papists, but all who are Arians come forth from you, Lutherans and Calvinists. Surely we have learned from you, not from the Papists, that absolutely nothing should

be believed, which is not expressly contained in the sacred Writings. But because we do not expressly read the words homousion. Trinity, essence, person, relation and property in the Scriptures, we are forced to condemn all of them. From you we have learned to give consent to the judgment neither of the Fathers, nor of the Councils, nor of the whole Church, but only to the spirit. However, the spirit dictates this to us that we cannot, with a good conscience, believe or say anything else. From you we have learned that the Pope pertains to the Antichrist, and that Bishops, Monks and all Papists are members of the Antichrist. But who believes that the Antichrist believes rightly about Christ? Or that the true Christ is preached by the Antichrist? Therefore if we want to be true to ourselves, we must seek another Christ. Finally, we learned from you, not from the Papists, that the divinity of the Son obeys the Father, sacrifices to him, and can both suffer and die, and countless other things of the same kind. Really from these things, unless we are blockheads, we should gather together all the things that we now teach. What the Lutherans should respond to these things, we leave for them to figure out. But we for our part, with the help of God, will work hard to refute, as accurately and clearly as is possible, these blasphemous and horrible teachings, which completely destroy the Christ Faith, and prepare and strengthen the road to Mohammedanism,

THE ORDER OF THE ARGUMENT ABOUT CHRIST

There are five parts of this argument;

First, on the Divinity of Christ.

Second, on the personal Distinction from the Father and the Holy Spirit.

Third, on the Flesh, on the Incarnation of the Lord.

Fourth, on the Soul of Christ.

Fifth, on the Office of Mediator.

The order of the first question, which is: Whether Christ is one God in number with the Father and the Holy Spirit.

This question is the first and greatest among all the questions about Christ. But it has six parts:

First, the opinion of the new Samosatenians, who follow Servetus, will have to be explained.

Second, the opinion of the new Arians, who follow Valentinus Gentilis, must be explained.

Third, it must be proved that there is only one true Divinity in number, that is, only one true God.

Fourth, Christ is that one true God.

Fifth, the Holy Spirit is the same true God. For, from this it follows that Christ is one God in number with the Father and the Holy Spirit. For, that the Father is true God is admitted by all.

Sixth, all the objections of the adversaries will be answered.

CHAPTER I

THE OPINION OF THE NEW SAMOSATENIANS IS EXPLAINED

Now to the first point The author of the new Samosatenians was Michael Servetus who began to be known in the year 1532, according to Surius; but in 1555 he was burned to death in Geneva. Those who now have their principal seat in Transylvania followed him, the leaders of whom were Georgius Blandrata, who is still living, and Francis David, who, in the year 1580, since he denied that Christ should be invoked, was condemned to perpetual incarceration by the Prince of Transylvania; but shortly thereafter he became insane and died in the course of two days.

The doctrine of the Servetians teaches three things, and is composed of three ancient heresies. First of all, it says that there is no personal distinction in God. Thus Servetus in book 5 on the Trinity (page 189) and in his response to article 1, and the Transylvanian ministers in book 2, chapter 4. Hermogenes, Praxeas, Noetus and Sabellius long ago taught the same thing. Augustine mentions all of these in book 1, chapter 4 Ion the heresies. And then also Paul of Samosata, and Photinus, according to Hilaiy in his book *On the Councils*. Secondly, it says that Christ before the Incarnation did not exisL not even in the mind of God as an idea. Thus Servetus in book 3 on the Trinity (page 92), and the Hungarian ministers in book 2, chapter 3. This same idea long ago was taught by Ebion and Cerinthus as reported by Irenaeus in book 1, chapters 25 and 26, and then by Paul of Samosata and Photinus according to Augustine in his book on the heresies (44 and 45). Thirdly, it says that divinity was communicated by God to the man Christ not by eternal generation, but by the anointing of grace and indwelling and therefore that Christ can be called God, but a God made and temporal, not eternal. Thus Blandrata in disputation 6 Albana, and the ministers in books 2, chapter 7. Formerly Nestorius taught this same thing according to Theodoretus in book 4 on the heretics.

Now all the new Samosatenians agree on these three points. But they disagree among themselves on the invocation of Jesus Christ, and they have broken up into three different sects, more or less. For, Francis David and many of the Hungarian ministers teach that Jesus Christ should not be invoked, but only the Father, who alone is the true God, and alone at this time takes care of the Church. There are some theses on this matter of Francis David, and his response to the reasons of Faustus Socinus, who rejected those theses. But this Faustus asserts in the just mentioned refutation that Christ can be invoked in prayers, but still he adds that it is more perfect to go directly to God the Father.

Finally, Georgius Blandrata in his theses, and the Polish ministers in the judgment they published on the cause of Francis David, teach that Jesus Christ not only is to be invoked, but also that he must be invoked; they also say it is not an imperfection to flee to him. But this disagreement among them happened veiy opportunely, not only because, as St. Hilary says, war among heretics means peace for the Church, but also because both parties began to be reduced to veiy great difficulties. For, those who teach that Christ should be invoked cite more than fifty texts of Scripture, to which they show that the adversaries are opposed; but those who say he should not be invoked demonstrate with a very certain reason that the adversaries are fighting with each other, since they do not want the saints to be invoked, because they are not true Gods, and nevertheless they want Christ to be invoked, whom the very same people say openly is not the true God.

CHAPTER II

THE OPINION OF THE NEW ARIANS IS EXPLAINED

Now with regard to the second point. The doctrine of Valentinus Gentilis, and of the others who were his associates or disciples, teaches three things.

First, it teaches that there are three eternal spirits—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—essentially different in number. Gentilis himself teaches this in thesis 20, and Benedict Aretius refers to this same thing at the beginning of the history of the punishment of Valentinus Gentilis. This opinion was formerly that of the Peratarians as related by Theodoretus in book 1, chapter 18 in his book on heretics. For, they said that the Trinity is three Gods, three minds, etc. It was also that of John Philoponus, as was recounted by Suidas in comments on John and by Nicephorus in book 18, chapter 48 of his history, who also says in chapter 46 that Philoponus lived at the time of the Emperor Phocae, about the year of our Lord 604.

A certain man from Gaul during the time of St. Anselm, around the year of our Lord 1090, taught the same thing, against whom St. Anselm wrote his book on the Incarnation of the Word. It also seems that the Abbot Joachim taught the same thing around the year 1190. For, he says that the three persons are not one thing, or one only essence, but only by gathering them together, just as many of the faithful are said to be one Church. This is clear from chapter 2 of the Lateran Council under Innocent III. Finally, according to the testimony of Bernard of Luxemburg Raimundus Lullus held this opinion around the year of our Lord 1260; he taught that the three persons are three essences. Secondly, Gentilis and his associates taught that these three persons are not equal, but that the Father is by far more eminent than the others, so that he must be said to be the essentiator and the other two the essentiati. Thus Gentilis in the book on the Antidotes (antid. 3, page 26) where he says that it is proper to the Father that he be called the one and only God. For similar ideas see theses 8, 10, 22, 24, 38 and 40. Therefore the new Tritheists already have abandoned Philoponus for Arius. For, Arius was the first one to teach that the Son is less than the Father, according to Epiphanius on the heresies 69. However, Arius appeared around the year of our Lord 324, according to Thedoretus in book 4 on the heretics. Thirdly, they taught that the Son of God was not from nothing, nor was he generated in time, but from eternity and from the essence of the Father. Gentilis says this in theses 11 and 21 and this was the opinion of the recent Arians. For, as St. Augustine teaches in book 6, chapter 1 of his work on the Trinity, the later Arians conceded that the Son is eternal, although Arius thought the contrary. Hence even Maximinus, as is stated in book 1 of Augustine's book, confessed that the Son is not from nothing, but is generated from the substance of the Father, according to the decree of the Council of Rimini. Perhaps it will not be beside the point, if we reproduce here some things from the theses of Valentinus, so that the Reader may get to know more exactly the thinking of the Arians from their own words. Thesis 6: *The Father is not a hypostasis, or a person in one God; but, according to the Apostle, he is that one God from whom is everything. 1. Only the Father is the one*

God, that is, without any principle or origin. 8. *He alone is* ἀυτοθεος, *that is, produced by no superior power, but God from himself.* 9. *He distinguishes the one God into three properties or persons, or he makes deceptions for himself, or he divides the substance of the one God necessarily, and dismembers it.* 10. *God had the power of generating and propagating, because he willed it; and therefore he generated the* λογος *before the world and propagated the spirit.* 11. *The eternal substance of the* λογος *had its principle and origin fi-om God, inasmuch as it is generated and distinct, not inasmuch as it is; for it was not created from nothing, or made from some non-existing matter, but it was generated from the immense substance of the supreme God.* 20. *The generated one differs from the substantial generator in number, not in power, thinking or diversity of nature.* 21. *The one God and his* λογος *are two intelligent substances of the same nature, that is, two eternal consubstantial spirits, distinct in a harmonious grade, order and property.* 22. *There cannot be several spirits of immense substance.* 24. *The Father alone is a spirit* ἀγενητος, *the author of the universe, and an immense substance; but the Son is a spirit, ineffably generated from the Father, executor of the paternal will, generated according to the measure of generation.* 33. *The confusion of the three into one and the same spirit was the foundation and origin of all the errors.*

CHAPTER III

IT IS DEMONSTRATED FROM SCRIPTURE AND THE FATHERS THAT THERE IS ONLY ONE GOD

Regarding the third question, the numeric oneness of God is to be proved against Peratas, Philoponus, Joachimus, and the contemporary Tritheists.

First of all, it is proved from the Scriptures. Thus in the law of Deut. 4:35: *The Lord,* Moses said, *is God and there is no other besides him.* And shortly after that: *Know therefore this day, and lay it to your heart, that the Lord is God in heaven above and on the earth beneath; there is no other* (v. 39). In chapter 6:4: *Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God is one God.* And in chapter 32:39: *See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no other beside me.*

These quotes cannot be referred to a specific unity; for, the one who speaks in the Scriptures, is not a universal God, nor the species itself of God, but it is the singular God, as is clear, because only singular things exist in reality, and speak and act. But a singular God falsely says that he is the one and only God, and beside him there is no other, if other individuals of the same species are found. For Adam could not have said truly after he had generated children, "I am the only man and beside me there is no other man."

The same thing is proved from the historical books. 1 Sam. 2:2: *There is none holy like the Lord, there is none besides thee.* 1 Kings 8:23: *O Lord God of Israel, there is no God like thee, in heaven above or on earth beneath.* But why does the God of Israel not have a similar, if there are two other individual natures under the same species? The same idea is proved from the Psalms: Ps. 18:31 : *For who is God but the Lord? And who is a rock except our God?* Ps. 83:18: *You alone are God.* The same is found in the prophets. Isa. 45:5:*1 am the Lord, and there is no other, besides me there is no other God.* And 45:21 *'.And was it not i the Lord? And there is no other God besides me, a righteous God and a Savior; there is none besides me.*

All the Prophets passim teach similar things. We find it also in the wisdom books. Wis. 12:13: *For there is no other God besides thee.* Sir. 1:8: *There is One who is wise, greatly to be feared.* The same idea is expressed by the Gospels. Matt. 4:10: *You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.* Mark 12:29: *The Lord our God, the Lord is one.* John 17:3: *May they know thee, the only true God.* The meaning here is: *You have the divinity, which alone is the true divinity; therefore, no other divinity is to be found.*

Finally, from the Apostles. 1 Cor. 8:4: *We know that... there is no God but one.* Likewise in the same place: *For us there is one God.* Gal. 3:20: *Now a mediator implies more than one, but God is one.* Eph. 4:6: *There is one God and Father of us all, who is above all and through all and in all.* 1 Tim. 6:15: *He is the only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords.*

From all of these texts it can be easily deduced that there is only one true God, who is not one in species, and it can also be understood from similar expressions. For we would not rightly say about some one man that he is the only man; or that only he is a true man; or besides him there is no other man; or he is a man and no one else is. No other reason

can be given for this, except that human nature is not in one individual only, but in many. But we say correctly about the sun, of which there is only one: this is the only true Sun, there is one Sun in the world, besides it there is no other Sun, etc.

Secondly, it is proved from the Fathers. All the Fathers passim say that there is one God, as Justin in his work on the right Faith, Augustine in book 1 against Maximinus, and others. About this matter there is no doubt, but because they could respond, when the Fathers say there is one God, the Fathers are speaking about specific unity, not numerical; on this account, we will demonstrate from the Father in many ways that there is only one God. First, if there were many individual divinities, as they say, they could be said to be one God, that is, one divine species, as Porphyry says in chapter 2 that several men are one man, that is, one human species, but it could not be denied, unless they also correctly said there are several Gods, just as we rightly say that Adam, Abel and Cain are three men; but the Fathers constantly deny that the three persons are three Gods; therefore they say there is only one God. What they deny is clear from Athanasius in the Creed: *God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Spirit; however they are not three Gods, but there is one God.* Cyril in book 9, chapter 30 on John said: *It is the same substance of the divinity, and therefore we preach not three, but one God.*

Basil wrote an Oration against those who tell lies about us that we say there are three Gods. Gregory of Nyssa wrote a book for Ablabius that one must not say there are three Gods. Augustine in book 2, chapter 1 against Maximinus said: *Hold fast to the Catholic faith that the Father is not who the Son is; and the Son is not who the Father is; and that the Father is God and the Son is God: however, both together are not two Gods but one.* And in the same place he says that the Arians did not dare to say there are two, although that is what they really thought: *But,* he said, *although you do not deny that two Gods are worshipped by you, still you have not dared to admit it. For you knew that Christian ears could not bear to hear that two Gods are to be worshipped.*

But why can Christian ears not bear it, if there really are two distinct Gods? Ambrose in book 1, chapter 3 of his book on Faith says: *God is in God, but there are not two Gods.* And in the same place he says repeatedly that the Divinity of the Father and of the Son is absolutely the same; and he adds that nature itself proclaims that there is one God, just as there is one world. Similar things are found in all the Fathers. Secondly, the Fathers deny that a number is to be found in the Divinity, and they admit it only in the personal properties; but it certainly would be false to say that the Divinity cannot be numbered, if the Divinity were not actually uniquely one. Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration 3 on Theology said: *These three are one, if you look at the Divinity; and the one is three, if you consider the nature of the properties.* Fulgentius in chapter 1 on the Faith to Peter said: *Trinity refers to the persons, Unity to the nature.* Certainly the Trinity is numerical or unique, not specific, even according to the adversaries; therefore it is opposed to numerical unity. Athanasius says in the Creed: *The Catholic Faith is this, that we worship Unity in the Trinity, and Trinity in the Unity:* and he explains immediately that the Trinity is that of Persons, the Unity of the Divinity. Basil in letter 141 says that all number must be omitted from the essence of God. But note that, when he says that God is not one in number, he wants to say that God is not composed, so that he contains

in himself a true number formed from many unities. Gregory of Nyssa in his book on the Trinity to Eustathius: *To extend the number of the Godhead to a multitude belongs to those only who suffer from the plague of polytheistic error.* Ambrose in book 1, chapter 2 on Faith: *The unity of power excludes the quantity of number, because unity is not a number.* Hormisdas in chapter 2 of his letter to Justinian said: *Even if the idea of person admits a number, still the unity does not admit the separation of the essence.* The Council of Toledo XI in chapter 1: *In the relationships of the Persons there appears number, but in the substance of the Godhead nothing is comprised that could be counted.* Anastasius of Antioch in his book on correct dogma said: *We say a Trinity not of essences, but of persons; for we glorify one God, not in the number of the persons, but in nature; for what pertains to God, this is absolutely one in number.* And further on: *Therefore the Holy Trinity in essence is one God, but in number a Trinity.* You can see the books of this author in the library of the holy Fathers, Tome 8.

Thirdly, the Fathers often call God singular, or his nature individual. Justin in his book *On the Sole Government of God,* wanting to prove there is one God, said: Æschylus, *in expounding the arrangement of his work, expressed himself also as follows respecting the only God.* And from the title itself of the book on the government of God, Justin shows clearly that he acknowledges one God only. For a monarchy cannot be said to be the government of many of the same species, but of one individual alone. Likewise Athenagoras in his *Plea for the Christians* said: *Our every word celebrates the one God, etc.* Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration for Evagrius on the Divinity said: *The nature of the supreme God is individual.* Augustine in book 1 against Maximinus, or in the Colloquy with Maximinus at about the middle said: *Father, Son and Holy Spirit are one because of the individual and same nature.* Ambrose in book 1, chapter 2 on Faith said: *Since therefore the Lord flows from the Lord, acknowledge the unity of the Godhead; for the unity of operation does not make for a plurality in the Godhead.*

Fourthly, the Fathers not once have denied that God is one in species. Cyril in book 11, chapter 20 of his work on John, after he had said that the Apostles are consubstantial among themselves, and similarly the Father and the Son among themselves, *adds: Although consubstantiality is said not in the same way about us, and about the Father and the Son.* But consubstantiality is said about us truly and properly specifically; therefore, about the divine persons it is not said specifically, but numerically. Augustin in book 7, last chapter, of his work on the Trinity asks: whether the divine essence is a genus or a species, and he denies it about both—and he does it for two reasons. First, because although a genus, like animal, is divided into species—man, horse, lion, and a species, like man, is divided into individuals—Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the other individual men; nevertheless, one animal and one man are singular, and they cannot be divided any further. But the essence of God is said to be one essence, and God is said to be one God; therefore, God is not divided into several individuals. Second, because three men are more than two, and two are more than one; but the three persons in God are not more than two, or one; therefore the three persons are not three persons of the same species.

Fifthly, the Fathers say it is an ineffable mystery how the three persons are one God; but if they were one God in species, there would be no mystery. Nazianzen in his Oration

for Evagrius tries to show with many examples how the one and simple nature of God is common to the three; but there would be no such question, if the divine nature were one specifically. The same Father in his Oration for Heronus, or for Maximum according to others: *But now,* he said, *it is enough to teach the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in the Trinity; both its division and its union is entirely worthy of admiration,* Augustine in book 1 on Maximinus, or in the Colloquy with Maximinus, towards the middle, said: *The ineffable and lofty union of the Trinity manifests one God, one Lord.* Also, in book 7, last chapter, of his book on the Trinity, after he debated at length how three persons are one essence, and after removing all similitudes, concludes: *If it cannot be grasped by the intellect, let it be held by faith.*

Sixthly, the Fathers, like Basil in his Oration against Sabellius and Arius, Nazianzen in his Oration on the Nativity of the Lord, Ambrose in book 1, chapters 1 and 2 on Faith, say that Sabellius pertains to the Jews, and Arius to the pagans, but that the Church occupies a middle position, which indeed does not believe one person with the Jews, nor several natures with the Gentiles. But the Church will not really occupy the middle, if it multiplies the divine nature; for thus it will have nothing in common with the Jews, and she will agree wholly with the Gentiles, since many of them worship gods of the same species, like Jupiter, Mars, Mercury, etc. Additionally, as the Fathers teach, the Gentiles, although commonly they worship several gods, nevertheless they could know naturally one God, just as really the philosophers knew one God, and because of that they were almost naturally Christian. But if the Fathers had spoken about one God, not in number but in species, they would be saying nothing; for, the common people made the heavenly gods not only of the same species, but also blood relatives. From this is derived the frequently repeated saying of Virgil, which he took from Homer: *Father of the gods and King of men.*

First of all, this is clear from several clear testimonies of the ancient poets, concerning whom Justin composed his book *On the Sole Government of God.* In his first apology to Antoninus he says that Socrates and Plato in this regard were Christians. Athenagoras shows the same thing by quoting many testimonies of old pagans in his apology for Christ. Irenaeus in book 2, chapter 5 says that there is one God can be known naturally by all. Tertullian in chapter 17 of his Apology says that even the worshippers of idols, when they are in dire need, raise their eyes to heaven and, having forgotten their gods, naturally invoke the one God. Cyprian teaches the same thing in tractate 4 on the vanity of idols. Amobius in book 2 against the Heathen: *Let us commit ourselves to God, and let not our incredulity prevail more with us than the greatness of His name and power, lest, while we are seeking out arguments for ourselves, through which that may seem false which we do not wish and deny to be true, the last day steal upon us, and we be found in the jaws of our enemy, death.* And in book 3 against the Heathen he says that many Greeks and Latins rejected the many gods of the Gentiles, and that among them Cicero in his book on the nature of the gods so effectively demonstrated that there could not be many gods, that there were not lacking those who thought that the books should be destroyed by a decree of the Senate. Lactantius in book 1, chapter 3 says that there is no one, who, if he consults his reason, does not understand that there is one God, and he proves it: with

the whole book from Plato and the other philosophers. You will see similar statements in Clement's *Exhortation to the Heathen,* in Eusebius's book 11, chapter 9 on preparation, and in book 2 of Theodotus in his book on the Greeks.

Finally, Paul Orosius in book 6, chapter 1 of his History says that the common opinion of wise men is that there is only the one, true God, but that the others who are called gods, are nothing except servants and ministers of the one God. Prudentius wrote almost the same thing in αποθεώσει:

Of the Father's love begotten, ere the worlds began to be,
He is Alpha and Omega, He the source, the ending He,
Of the things that are, that have been,
And that future years shall see, evermore and evermore!

Thirdly, it is proved with reasons. The first reason is that God is the supreme being, as is clear from Exod. 3:14: *I am who I am;* therefore God is supremely one. For, one is a quality of being, and therefore the more something is being, it is also more one. Likewise, the more perfectly something has being, by that it is more removed from non-being, and therefore from division, which is the way to non-being. Therefore God is one not in species, but in number; for this is the greatest unity, which is not further divisible.

The second reason is that God is his own being, as is evident, both from the same text of Exod. 3:14, *I am who I am;* and also, because by the consent of all God lacks all composition; therefore, in God his being and essence are the same. Therefore the essence of God is not multipliable, and divisible into several individuals; for, the proper being of one cannot be divided in any way, so that it is suitable for many. But the being of God is the essence itself of God; therefore the essence of God is in no way divisible into several others.

You will say that by this argument it is proved only that the essence of this God cannot be multiplied, but not the essence of God in common. I respond that it is proved also with regard to the essence of God in common. For this please note that *being* or *existence* is not something that can be abstracted from several others, as it is nature, nor is being something contractable through the differences, or contracting like the differences, but being is the actuality itself of all things that exist. Because of this, the result is that in creatures in which the being and the essence are not absolutely the same, one can be multiplied without the other. For, the common nature can be abstracted from the singulars, while its own existence remains in each singular thing. But in God, where essence and existence are absolutely the same, as it is proper for this God to be this God, so it is proper to be God, and a common nature cannot be abstracted.

The third reason is that God is the most high, as the Scriptures teach passim, for example in Ps. 83:18: *You are the Most High over all the earth.* Sir. 1:8: *One is Most High;* therefore there is only one, for if there were several, or if they were equally high, then there is no one who is above all; or one is higher than the others, and so he alone would be the one true God.

The fourth reason is the final end of all things. Prov. 16:4: *The Lord has made*

everything for its purpose. And Rev. 1:8: *I am the alpha and the omega, the beginning and the end.* Therefore there is only one God, for if there were many gods, either all would be referred to one, and he alone would be the true God, or they would not be so referred, and then there would be no final end of all things.

The fifth reason is because God is infinite in essence, power and wisdom, etc. and therefore he is one in number, for the infinite comprehends everything. Ps. 145:3: *And his greatness is unsearchable.*

The sixth reason is, if there were many gods, either all have no principle, or one is from another; the first case is impossible, because then there would be many first disparate principles, and they would divide the world into various parts, at least because they would not agree in one and the same will. Then one could want one thing, and another something else. Hence even the pagans called Jupiter the father of the gods. If one is from another, it would be either by creation or by generation. If the first case, then the second is a creature and therefore he is not God. And so the recent Arians and Tritheists do not dare to say that the Son is created, since they want him to be God, although they fight among themselves because they make God uncreated, and still want him to be another God from the true God. If the second case, either he gave his whole substance, or a part of it; if a part, then he is a partial God; if the whole substance, then they have the exact same Divinity.

The seventh reason is that God is the ruler of the world: *But it is thy providence, 0 Father, that steers its course.* But a simple Monarchy is the best form of government, when a good and wise Prince can be found, as is known from the consensus of all. The Christians who teach this are Justin in his *Hortatory Address to the Greeks,* Cyprian in tractate 4 where he also proves with this argument that God is one, because Monarchy is the best form of government; Athanasius in his Oration against idols, Chrysostom in his last homily on the letter to the Hebrews, Gregory in book 4, letter 52. From the Jews, Philo in his book on the confusion of languages. From the Gentiles, Plato on politics, Aristotle in book 8, chapter 10 on morals, and in part 12 of his Metaphysics. Plutarch in his work on the form of a Republic, Herodotus in the book called *Thalia;* John Strobaeus in sermon 45 where he cites many others on this same point. Therefore God is a Monarch, that is, the one and only supreme Lord of all created things; and therefore he is the one and only true God.

And from these quotes certain places of the Fathers should be understood, which in other respects seem to be somewhat more difficult. For, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and others sometimes compare the three divine persons with three men, or with three angels. But they want to teach nothing other than that there are three true supposits or persons of the same nature. Although those Fathers do not everywhere say that the identity of nature is much greater in the divine persons than it is in the three men or in the three angels, still they never deny it, and in some places they even say it, as we showed above. On this point see St. Anselm in his book on the Incarnation where he explicitly teaches that the three persons are one God only.

CHAPTER IV

THE DIVINITY OF THE SON OF GOD IS ASSERTED

Regarding the fourth question, we have to prove that the Son of God is true God, and therefore one God numerically with the Father. For, no one denies that the Father is true God, and this is clear from John 17:3: *That they know you the only true God.* But this has to be proved very carefully, for at this time it is denied both by the new Arians and the new Samosatenians, and also by all Jews and Mohammedans. We will present nine classes of arguments. The first is from the Old and New Testaments; the second from the Old Testament, the third from the New Testament; the fourth from the names of God; the fifth from his works; the sixth from his attributes; the seventh from the Fathers; the eighth from Sibyls; the ninth from miracles.

The first class from both Testaments

In the first place, we will present testimonies that are found in the Old Testament on the unique and true God of Israel, and are expressed in the New Testament about Christ; against this argument no rebuttal can be found. In Numbers 21:5-6 Moses said: *And the people spoke against God and against Moses: Why have you brought us up out of Egypt, etc. Then the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people, etc.* Here by the agreement of all he is talking about the true and supreme God whom only the Jews knew. And the Servetians and Gentilists have this for an axiom, namely, that the God of Israel is the true God and he alone is the Father. But in 1 Cor. 10:9 Paul says that he is the Christ: *We must not put Christ to the test,* he said, *as some of them did and were destroyed by serpents;* therefore it is necessary that Christ is the true God, and one God entirely with the Father.

In the second place there is Exodus 20 and the letter of Jude. For, in Exod. 20:2 it is said: *Iam the Lord your God, who brought you out of the land of Egypt;* and in Deut. 32:12: *The Lord alone did lead him, and there was no foreign God with him.* And Jude says in verse 5: *Jesus saved a people out of the land of Egypt, and afterward destroyed those who did not believe. And the angels, etc.* Bede also mentions this argument in this place.

The third place is Ps. 68:17-18 where it is said of the God of Israel: *With mighty chariotry, twice ten thousand, thousands upon thousands, the Lord came from Sinai into the holy place. Thou didst ascend the high mount, leading captives in thy train, and receiving gifts among men.* And Paul attributes this same thing to Christ in Eph. 4:7-8: *But grace was given to each of us,* he said, *according to the measure of Christ's gift. Therefore it is said: When he ascended on high he led a host of captives, and he gave gifts to men.*

The fourth and fifth places are in Ps. *9TJT.AÏI his angels adore him;* and Ps. 102:25-26: *Of old thou didst lay the foundations of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They will perish, but thou dost endure, etc.* Paul applies both these places to Christ in Hebrews 1, where he proves that He is greater than the angels, because according to Ps. 97:7 the angels are commanded to adore Christ, and according to Ps. 102:25 Christ is called the creator of heaven and earth, which in no way applies to angels.

The sixth place is Isa. 6:1-3: *I saw the Lord sitting upon a throne, high and lifted up; and his train filled the temple. Above him stood the Seraphim; each had six wings: with two he covered his face, and with two he covered his feet, and with two he flew. And one called to another and said: Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord of hosts; the whole earth is full of his glory.* And below that: *And he said: Go, and make the heart of this people fat, and shut their eyes.* Now the majesty of God could not be described more clearly. And although the adversaries attribute this to God alone, still John 12:40 applies it to Christ. For, after he quotes the words of Isa. 6:40: *He has blinded their eyes and hardened their heart, lest they should see with their eyes and perceive with their heart, and turn for me to heal them,* he then adds: *Isaiah said this because he saw his glory and spoke of him.* Accordingly, the same John in Rev. 4:8 says that he heard them shouting: *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come.* But who is to come except Christ?

For it is about him that we read in the Creed: *He will come again in glory to judge the living and the dead.* And it is about him that St. Paul said in Phil. 3:20: *We await a Savior, the Lord Jesus Christ.* And in 2 Tim. 4:1: *I charge you... by his appearing and his kingdom;* and after that: *and not only to me but also to all who have loved his appearing.* And in Acts 1:11 the angels say: *This Jesus who was taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way, etc.* Finally, nothing is repeated more frequently in the Scriptures than the coming of Christ for judgment. Hence it should not be concluded that the Trisagion applies to Christ alone, since without doubt it refers to the Trinity of the Divine Persons. For those words, *who is and who was and who is to come* are usually expressed in three ways. Aretas the Greek, in comments on Rev. 1, applies *Who is* to the Father; *Who was to the Son; Who is to come* (for this is the way he reads it) to the Holy Spirit; and for a similar reason he could, if he wished, apply *Who is* to the Father; *Who was* to the Holy Spirit; *Who is to come* to^t Son. Bede and Rupert, in their comments on Rev. 1, apply this whole passage to the Father, but in the Father, because of the unity of the nature, they understand also the Son and the Holy Spirit. However, Primasius, Haymo and St. Thomas in their comments on Rev. 1 and 4 explain veiy well as really belonging to the Son, *Who is* because of his immutability; *Who was* because of his eternity; and *Who is to come* because of uniformity; and (as St, Thomas point out) since Christ because of the suffering of the Cross was believed to be extinct, St. Thomas fitly says about him, *Who is* truly living; and *Who was,* also before he was born of the Virgin; and *Who is to come,* to benefit both the wicked and the faithful by the merits of his sufferings. However, in the Son, who alone will appear visibly at the judgmenζ the Father and the Holy Spirit will also come invisibly. For the authority of judging will be from the whole Trinity, although only the Son will exercise the judgment itself in a human form. For, the Father has given all judgment to the Son (John 5:22).

The seventh place is Isa. 8:13-15: *But the Lord of hosts, him you shall regard as holy; let him be your fear, and let him be your dread. And he will become a sanctuary, and a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.* Here openly, also with the agreement of all the Jews, he is called the mighty God, and the Lord of hosts—a sanctuary to some, a stone of offense to some, a rock of stumbling, a snare and ruin.

But Luke, Peter and Paul attribute this same idea to Christ. For in Luke 2:34 Simeon

says about Christ: *He is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel.* And in Rom. 9:30-33: *What shall we say, then? That Gentiles who did not pursue righteousness have attained it, that is, righteousness through faith; but that Israel who pursued the righteousness which is based on law did not succeed in fillfilling that law. Why? Because they did not pursue it through faith, but as if it were based on works. They have stumbled over the stumbling stone, as it is written: Behold I am laying in Zion a stone that will make them stumble.* There is also 1 Pet. 2:7-8: *The very stone which the builder rejected has become the head of the corner, and the stone that will make men stumble, a rock that will make them fall.*

The eighth place is Isaiah 40:3: *A voice cries: In the wilderness prepare the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God.* These words are said by Isaiah about God. For the Jews did not call absolutely another their Lord and God except the one true God, and especially the prophets and other holy men. But all the Evangelists bear witness that this voice is John, who prepared the way for Christ (see Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4; John 1:23). Therefore Christ is that Lord and God of Israel, whom the adversaries say is the Father only.

The ninth place is Isa. 45:22-23: *I am God, and there is no other. By myself I have sworn... to me every knee shall bow.* Rom. 14:10-11: *We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written: As I live, says the Lord, every knee shall bow to me.* Here you see how, according to the Apostle, Christ is that God, besides whom there is no other God.

The tenth place is Isa. 41, 44, 48: *I am the first, I am the last.* Those things are said passim about the God of Israel. In Rev. 1:8 we read: *Iam the alpha and I am the omega.* And below that: *Iam the first and the last, and the living one; I died, and behold, etc.*

The eleventh place is Mal. 3:1: *Behold, I send my messenger to prepare the way before my face.* Here also the God of Israel is speaking; for, all the codices—Hebrew, Greek, Chaldean, Latin—have: *before my face;* nevertheless Christ himself in Matt. 11:10 says that this angel is John the Baptist, who prepared the way before the face of Christ. And in Luke 1:76 Zechariah says: *You will go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways.* What could be clearer? For, for whom did John prepare the way except for Christ?

But it will be worth the effort to see how the adversaries respond to this. For, although they do not respond to all, still they have tried to respond to some. Therefore, the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 20 respond in general that it is possible to attribute to Christ the things said about God, because God communicated his divinity to Christ. Then in particular. To the first place they respond: the meaning here is: *We will not tempt our Christ, as they tempted their God.* Or, *Let us not really tempt Christ, as they tempted the same Christ in figure.* For in the same place it is said that everything happened to them in figure. I did not see a response to the second place. Francis David responds to the third one, and also Blandrata in Disputation 5, where he says the words, *Ascending on high,* are a prophecy about the future Christ, but that this is not said about the God of Israel. Francis David in Disputation 3 and Blandrata in Disputation 6 respond to the fourth place by saying that Christ is to be adored, because God commanded it, however not as the Most High, but as the Son of the Most High.

The fifth place gets a response from the Transylvanian Ministers in book 2, last chapter,

and from Francis David in the Disputations of the third day; they say that the words, *Of old, Lord, thou didst lay the foundations of the world,* should be understood to be about the Father only, and also on Heb. 1 because Paul wanted to show that Christ is the Son of the true God, and therefore he made an apostrophe to the Father, saying: *And you, O Lord, etc.* And they prove this, first, because otherwise Paul would be in conflict with the article of the Apostles' Creed, where the Father alone is said to be the creator of heaven and earth. Secondly, he would be in conflict with Christ, who often calls his Father the creator of heaven and earth, as in Matt. 11:25: *I thank thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, etc.* Thirdly, because he would be in conflict with himself, because he already said that the world was made through the Son; therefore the Son did not create the world, but the Father through the Son. Fourthly, because he would unsuitably compare the Son with the angels, if the Son were the creator, since there is no comparison between the creator and the creature.

To the sixth place from Isa. 6 and John 12 Basilius responds in Disputation 2 Alban, that the vision is a figure; for no one has ever seen God as he is in himself, and therefore from that vision nothing is proved. To the ninth place, Francis David suggests an answer in Disputation Alban. 8 where he says that every knee bends to Christ, not because he is the Most High God, who speaks in Isa. 45, but because God exalted the man Christ, *and bestowed on him the name which is above every name* (Phil. 2:9), that is, the name of Yahweh; and *that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow.* To the tenth place from the words: *I am the first, I am the last,* Francis David responds in Disputations Alban. 3 and 8 that those words are not to be accepted in the same way when they are said about God in Isa. 48:12, and when they are said of Christ in Rev. 1:8. For, in the book of Revelation they are understood to be about Christ the man, because of what follows: *and I died, etc.* Therefore Christ is said to be *First,* because he is exalted above all things; *Last,* because he is the fulfillment of God's works.

But all these points are easily refuted. And first, things said in the Old Testament about the God of Israel cannot therefore be applied to Christ, because the God of Israel communicated his divinity with Christ. For if, as they say, Christ did not exist before he was born of Maiy, and therefore God made Christ God in time; therefore things said about God could not be adapted to Christ before that time. But Paul in 1 Cor. 10:9 says that Christ was tempted by the Jews in the wilderness, when they departed from Egypt. Also I ask: how did God give his divinity to Christ? For, he did not give it by generating him from eternity, for they deny that; but he gave it, as they say, by indwelling and anointing. But in this way God gives his divinity also to angels and holy men, and still the things said about God in the Scriptures cannot be applied to them. Moreover, the indwelling of God in Christ cannot make Christ God, otherwise the palace of kings would be a King; anointing does not confer true divinity, but a certain created participation, as has been pointed out. Therefore the things said about the one and only true God of Israel cannot be attributed to the one who is God only by anointing.

The answer to the first place has no value, for Paul refers both their temptation and ours to the same Christ; therefore we cannot distinguish and say that they tempted God and we tempted Christ. And what they say about a figure does not apply. For, the figures of the Old Testament are true histories literally, and should be explained according to the

proper meaning of the words, even though they also signify something else, as is clear from all of chapter 10 in 1 Cor. For, the sons of Israel are said to have fornicated, and to have worshipped idols, and so they were punished by God in various ways, and in all of this there is a figure of the Christian people, who will be punished in the same way, if they commit similar sins. But certainly they fornicated really and literally, they worshipped idols and so they were punished; therefore also it is to be understood really and literally that they tempted Christ. You can add to this that the Transylvanians resorted to figures only lest they be forced to admit that Christ existed before he was born of the Virgin. But in the same place Paul says clearly that in the wilderness with Moses Christ (as God, that is, not as man) was present to the Jews: *All drank,* he said, yrow *the supernatural Rock which followed them, and the Rock was Christ,* that is, the Jews in the wilderness drank water from the rock, but that rock was not material, which provided drink by its own power, but it was another invisible and spiritual rock, which was always with them, and accompanied them, and provided everything for them: but that rock was Christ, and all authors explain it in this way; another meaning cannot easily be invented.

The solution of the third place is not valid. For, David in Ps. 68:18 is prophesying about the future ascension of Christ, and nevertheless in the same place he says about the same Christ that he descended of old on mount Sinai and traveled with the people through the wilderness; and he says other things, which cannot be applied to him who did not exist before the Incarnation. Hence rightly Jerome and Theodoretus, in their explanation of this text, say that David wanted to signify that he is one and the same, who descended on Mount Sinai long ago, and who afterwards ascended into heaven in the presence of his Apostles.

The solution of the fourth place is not solid, because we are not arguing from adoration, but from what Paul said was written about Christ in Ps. 97:7, namely, that it was certainly written about the God of Israel. Hence it follows that Christ is the God of Israel. Hence our argument is not that Christ is commanded to be adored by the angels, and therefore he is the true God (although this is a good argument, and St. Paul uses it); rather, this is our argument: David in Ps. 97 says that the God of Israel must be adored by the angels, but Paul says: Christ is the one, who by the decree of David must be adored by the angels, and therefore David, according to Paul, is asserting that Christ is the God of Israel.

The solution of the fifth place is a pure corruption of Scripture. For, Paul is not making an apostrophe to the Father, but he cites various places about Christ, and among others that place, which is obvious from the conjunction "and": *Of the angels he says: Who makes his angels winds, and his servants flames of fire. But of the Son he says, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever... and thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning.*

But the petty syllogisms of the Transylvanians have little weight, and it is surprising that they were not refuted by Peter Melius. To the First and Second I say that the Father of Christ is the creator, but not without his word, with whom just as there is one God, so also there is one creator. To the Third reason I say that there is no conflict to be the creator and to be the one through whom God the Father creates. For, the same Christ said in John 5:17: *My Father is working still, and I am working,* and nevertheless he says in John 14:10: *The Father who dwells in me does his works.* Therefore, both truly create, because both have in themselves omnipotence, and the same omnipotence. However, the Father is said to

create through the Son, not the Son through the Father, because God created the world by his power and his wisdom. But the Son is called by Paul *the power and wisdom of God* in 1 Cor. 1:24, and *the arm of the Lord* by Isaiah in chapter 53:1.

To the Fourth reason I say that Paul compares Christ with the angels, because he was going to say that he was made lower than the angels because of his passion. Therefore lest we should think that Christ is absolutely inferior to the angels, he compares him with the angels, and shows that there is really no comparison between them, since Christ is the Son, but the angels are servants. On this point see Athanasius in Oration 2 on the Arians.

The solution to the sixth place has no value, because although Isaiah did not see the essence of God, still the image which he saw represented the God of Israel; and since John says that Christ is that image, it follows that Christ is the God of Israel.

The solution of the ninth place proves nothing, because Paul in Rom. 14:11 not only says that every knee should bend before Christ, as Phil. 2 says, but he adds that it was written, and he cites the text of Isaiah (45:23) where the God of Israel speaks about himself. From this it is patently clear that Christ is the God of Israel. There is no objection to this in what is said in Phil. 2:9: *God bestowed on him the name which is above every name;* for, according to the Commentary of Ambrose, the Father gave the Son a name above every name through his eternal generation; according to almost all others, after the resurrection he gave to the man Christ the name above every name, that is, the name of the true God, not because before that he did not have it, but because it was not known. But God so glorified him, in order that the whole world would know that that crucified man is the true God. And that this text should be understood to be about the manifestation of this name is evident, because he asked for it in John 17:5: *Father, glorify me with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made.* Furthermore, this is explained in Phil. 2:11: *And every tongue will confess, etc.* Finally, even before his death Christ was called the Son of the living God (see Matt. 16:16 and John 11:27), and passim he is called "Lord," for example in John 13:13: *You call me Teacher and Lord, and you are right, for so I am.* Therefore he did not receive the name of being the Son of God because of his death, but because of his manifestation. See book 4, chapter 2 of Cyril's Thesaurus, where he gives an excellent treatment of this matter.

The solution of the tenth place is like the prior ones. For, these words, *I am the first, I am the last,* are not to be understood in a different way in Revelation than they are in Isaiah, because it says in Revelation, *And I died;* for we contend that the one who died according to the form of a man, is also the true God, eternal, the first and the last according to the form of God, as Isaiah said; for, John had in mind the words of Isaiah. Further, Christ is called absolutely the first and the last, just as the letters *alpha* and *omega* are absolutely the first and the last. But if Christ were only the first among creatures, and the fulfillment of the works of God, he would not be simply the first and the last, but only such in a certain respect. For, God alone is simply the first principle, and the last end of all things.

CHAPTER V

THE SECOND CLASS IS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

The first place is Ps. 2, which is understood to be about Christ, both because Rabbi Salomon and other Rabbis explain it in terms of the Messiah, according to Galatinus in book 3, chapter 7, and also because it is understood about Christ in Acts 4:25-26 and 13:33, in Hebrews 1, and certainly Paul writing to the Hebrews would not put forth an argument from this Psalm against the Hebrews, unless he knew that the Hebrews were accustomed to understand that this Psalm referred to Christ. Therefore in this Psalm it is said, *You are my son, today I have begotten you.* And lest we think that the Messiah is the Son of God by adoption, in the same way as Israel was said to be the first-bom of God, he adds: *Now, therefore, O kings, be wise; be warned, O rulers of the earth. Serve the Lord withfear, etc.* Here note that in the Hebrew source, which the adversaries always demand, the words are p *Kiss the Son,* that is, as a sign of subjection kiss the hand and foot of the Son. And there is no opposition to us in the way the LXX renders it: *Learn discipline.* For they were looking at the meaning, not at the words. For then we truly adore Christ, when we accept his teaching.

Note also in the following words: *Lest when the Lord is angry;* in Hebrew the word "Lord" is not present, but the words, *Lest he be angry,* namely the Son, refer to the Son. From this we understand that the word "Lord," which was added by the LXX, is to be referred to the Son. Accordingly what follows is also necessarily understood: *For his wrath is quickly kindled. Blessed are all who take refuge in him.* Here is the argument: the Messiah is the Son of God who must be adored by all Kings; all those with whom he is angiy will perish, and those who trust in him will be blessed; therefore the Messiah is the true God. For, only the true God has dominion over life and death, 1 Sam. 2:6. Likewise, in the Scriptures passim it is said that one should put his trust in God alone, as in Jer. 17:5, *Cursed is the man who trusts in man.* And after that: *Blessed is the man who trusts in the Lord* (v. 7).

The second place is Isa. 48:12: *Hearken to me, O Jacob, and Israel, whom I called! lam he, lam the first, and I am the last. My hand laid the foundation of the earth, and my right hand spread out the heavens.* And after that: *Draw near to me, hear this: from the beginning I have not spoken in secret, from the time it came to be I have been there. And now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit* (v. 16). It is certain that the one sent is not the Father, both because the Father does not have anyone who can send him, and also because the Son says in John 8:18 that he was sent by the Father, and by the Holy Spirit in Luke 4:18. Still we see that the one sent is the Lord God, who made heaven and earth, and who is the first and the last. Paul Thurius responded to an objection raised against this place by Francis David in Disputation Alban. V, namely, that the words, *And now the Lord God has sent me,* were said by the prophet about himself; he accepted this explanation from Vatablus, but Vatablus got it from the Rabbis.

Francis David proves his opinion. First, if that text were understood to be about Christ, Christ would have existed before the Incarnation. But in 1 John 4:3 it says that

it is the spirit of Antichrist who says that Christ existed outside of and before the flesh. Second, because Paul says in Heb. 1 that God has spoken in these last days in his Son. Therefore in that passage of Isa. it is not Christ who is speaking, for he says that he spoke from the beginning. Third, because in that expression "I have been there," the "there" is usually explained by Catholics to mean "on Mount Sinai." But in Gal. 3:19 it is said that the Law was given on Mount Sinai by angels, not by Christ. But those reasons prove nothing, and it is surprising that Paul Thurius was not able to refute them.

To the first reason: John does not say that Christ did not exist before the flesh, but he says that he is Antichrist who denies the Incarnation of Christ, as at that time Ebion and Cyrinthus denied it, and now also the Transylvanians. For, these are the words of 1 John in 4:2-3: *Every spirit which confesses that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh is of God, and every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of Antichrist.* But what is it to dissolve Jesus, except to divide the Word from the flesh, and to say that the Son of God did not really become the son of man, but only dwelt in him as in a temple? But what does it mean that Jesus came in the flesh, but that the Word of God assumed true flesh in the unity of the hypostasis, and so, having become a true man, came to men?

To the second reason: Paul does not deny that the Word of God spoke before the Incarnation, but he says only that God in the last days spoke with a bodily mouth and voice through the incarnate Son, who formerly spoke through the mouth of the prophets.

To the third reason I say that the Law was given on Sinai by God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but with the assistance of angels. But what Isaiah says literally about Christ, is evident first of all from the Fathers: for we have the consensus of the Fathers. For, Origen in book 1 (past the middle) against Celsus, Eusebius in book 5, chapter 6 of his Demonstration, Athanasius in his sermon on the holy Mother of God, Chrysostom on the Holy Spirit towards the end of tome 3, Ambrose in book 2, chapter 4 on Christian faith, Jerome and Cyril in comments on this place in Isaiah, and Augustine in book 20 of *The City of God,* have explained the passage in this way. Moreover, the text itself declares: *From the time it came to be I have been there. And now the Lord God has sent me;* in Hebrew it reads like this: nmn ΠΠΠ'Π onv *from the time that it was, there am I,* and now the Lord God has sent me, that is, *when they were, I was there;* and the LXX translates it as, ήνικα έγένετο έκεϊ ήμην; or *before the time of being this,* that is, as Jerome translates it, *Before it came to be, I was there.* But what does this mean—*of being this?* Some explain it as heaven and earth, like Jerome, and then the meaning is: *Before it came to be,* or *When heaven and earth were made, I was there.* And this certainly cannot pertain to the Prophet.

Others understand by the word "this" the Law given on Sinai, and this also does not pertain to the Prophet personally, since he was bom many centuries after the Law was given, not to mention the creation of heaven and earth. Therefore these two explanation greatly favor our opinion. Others explain the prophecy as having this meaning: *When this prophecy took place, I was present.* But this is ridiculous: for, if someone does not exist, when does he speak? Some try to explain it in terms of the destruction of Babylon by Cyrus, because Isaiah spoke about this matter just previously: but *there,* that is, *in*

Babylon—Isaiah was not there, when it took place; in fact, Babylon was destroyed two hundred years after the death of Isaiah, and nevertheless here he is speaking about something already done, since he says, *When it took place,* or, *Before it took place.* The only thing remaining is that they say that the Prophet improvised by changing his person, and when he said in the person of God, *Before it came to be, I was there:* now in his own person he says, *Now the Lord God has sent me.* But opposed to this is the copulative "and," which is present in the Greek, Hebrew and Latin texts. For, that "and" forces a conclusion, and from the same word we understand everything. For, the one who said, *Before it came to be, I am there,* then adds, *And now the Lord God has sent me.* Otherwise, if it is permitted without an adequate reason to invent changes of persons, nothing certain could ever be gathered from the divine Writings.

The third place is Isaiah 35:4-6: *God himself will come and save you. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped; then shall the lame man leap like a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing for Joy.* It is clear that this passage is to be understood of Christ. First, because the Lord in Matt. 11:4-5 answers the disciples of John: *Go and tell John, etc. The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, and the deaf hear, etc.*

Second, because God never performed these signs through any Prophet. For, during the time of the Old Testament those who worked miracles were Moses, Joshua, Elijah, Elisha, and Isaiah himself. But none of them cured the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the lame; these are the signs given by Isaiah, and Christ passim performed them. Moreover, Isaiah is speaking about the future time: *God himself,* he said, *will come, etc.,* but all those Prophets, who worked some signs, did them before the time of Isaiah. Hence the Lord said in John 15:24: *If I had not done among them the works which no one else did, etc.*

Third, because the Fathers explain it this way. For example, Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 22, Cyprian in book 2, chapter 7 against the Jews, Eusebius in book 6, chapter 21 of his Demonstration, Jerome and Cyril in comments on this text. Likewise Cyril in book 4, chapter 28 on John, Augustine in chapter 6 of his book on the five heresies, Athanasius in his book (near the middle) on the humanity of the Word. But it is clear that the Lord God, about whom he is speaking here, is the God of Israel, because the Prophet says absolutely, *God himself will come:* for the Prophets absolutely never say that the false or metaphorical gods are God, and especially because that pronoun "himself' indicates the true God, not some minister who will come in his place.

The fourth place is Isa. 52:5-6: *Thus says the Lord: continually all the day my name is despised. Therefore my people shall know my name; therefore in that day they shall know that it is I who speak, here am I.* It is certain that the one who speaks at the beginning is the Lord God, because he uses the ineffable name, and complains that his name is despised, and he calls himself the God of Israel, and he calls the Jews his people, and finally he says that he is the one who spoke through the Prophets, and all of these things pertain only to the true God.

Now it is proved that Christ is that very same one. For he says, *It is I who speak, here am I.* So I ask when was the one present who spoke formerly through the prophets,

so that he would speak for himself, except when Christ was born? Hence this prophecy is rightly read on the night before the birth of the Lord, and everything that follows is wonderfully coherent. For immediately the Prophet, as if he saw Christ already walking on the mountains of Judea, and evangelizing, adds this: *How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him who brings good tidings, who publishes peace.* Likewise: *For eye to eye they see.* And after that he says: *The Lord has comforted his people, he has redeemed Jerusalem. The Lord has bared his holy arm before the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.* And further on: *The Lord will go before you, and the God of Israel will be your rear guard.* Finally, the Fathers give this explanation, like Tertullian in book 4, before the middle, of his work against Marcion, Eusebius in book 6, chapter 24 of his Demonstration, Ambrose in book 2, chapter 3 of his work on Faith, Jerome and Cyril in their comments on this place.

The fifth place is Isa. 45:14-15: *Thus says the Lord: The wealth of Egypt and the merchandise of Ethiopia, and the Sabeans, men of stature, shall come over to you and be yours, they shall follow you; they shall come over in chains and adore you. They will make supplication to you, saying: God is with you only, and there is no other, no God besides him. Truly, thou art a God who hides himself, O God of Israel, the Savior.* These words are said so clearly by the Lord God about his Son who is to be incarnate, as Jerome writes concerning this passage, that there can be no escape from the snares of this Testimony. For, although in the previous verses he was speaking about Cyrus, still, since the words, *There is no other God besides you,* are not fitting for Cyrus, it is necessaiy that they be said of Cyrus as representing Christ, or simply about Christ; and they cannot be understood of the Father, since it is the Father himself who says about another person: *They shall adore you and they will make supplications to you.* And he adds the words of the suppliants: *God is with you only, and there is no other God besides you.* Add to this that it is not rightly said to the Father, *God is with you only:* but all this is very fitting for Christ. For, God is also in him, since his humanity is a quasi temple of the divinity, and besides him there is no God, because he alone with the Father and the Holy Spirit is the true God.

The sixth place in Baruch 3:36-38: *This is our God; no other can be compared to him! He found the whole way to knowledge, and gave her to Jacob his servant and to Israel whom he loved. Afterward she appeared upon earth and lived among men.* Here the Prophet is speaking very clearly about the God of Israel, who alone does not have an equal, and who, after he conferred discipline on Israel, that is, the Law on Mount Sinai, finally having become man, he was seen upon the earth, and he lived among men. And this is how the Fathers explain it. For example, Cyprian in book 2, chapter 5 in his work against the Jews, Eusebius in book 6, chapter 19 of his Demonstration, Ambrose in book 1, chapter 2 on Faith, Hilary at the end of book 5 on the Trinity, Nazianzen in Oration 4 on Theology, and Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, near the end, Chrysostom in book 10 on Julian, Theodoretus at this place. The adversaries say nothing about this text, except that the book is apocryphal because it is not found in the Hebrew. But certainly greater by far is the authority of so many Fathers, who cite this book as sacred and canonical, than that of a few heretics who reject this book.

The seventh place is Zechariah 2:8-11 : *For thus said the Lord of hosts, after his glory sent me to the nations who plundered you, for he who touches you touches the apple of his eye: Behold, I will shake my hand over them, and they shall become plunder for those with served them. Then you will know that the Lord of hosts has sent me. Sing and rejoice, 0 daughter of Zion; for, lo, I come and I will dwell in the midst of you, says the Lord. And many nations shall join themselves to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people; and I will dwell in the midst of you, and you shall know that the Lord of hosts has sent me to you.* This passage is very efficacious, as Eusebius noted in book 5, chapters 25 and 26 of his Demonstration, Augustine in book 20, chapter 30 of *The City of God;* likewise Ambrose in book 2, chapter 3 of his work on Faith, Jerome, Theodoretus and Rupert in their Commentaries on this Prophet. For, truly the Lord of hosts is said to be sent by the Lord of hosts, and it is repeated frequently.

But Francis David responds in Disputation 8 that this text is not appropriate here, because it is a prophecy about the future, although the Prophet is speaking in the present. For, he is speaking about the conversion of the Gentiles, which happened after the ascension of Christ; from this it cannot be proved that Christ existed before the Incarnation. In addition, Francis David denies that it was written as, *the Lord sent me the Lord.*

That is not correct. For, we are not putting emphasis on the past or the future, but on the fact that the one who says he was sent by the Lord of hosts, also calls himself the Lord of hosts. And since it is certain that there is only one Lord of hosts, it follows that Christ is the one and the same God and Lord of hosts with his Father, although they are distinguished personally. But Francis David shamelessly denies that it was written, *the Lord sent me the Lord,* for although it is not written with these words placed together, nevertheless it is written with these words, even though there are some other words placed between them, as is evident.

The eighth place is Zechariah 3:1-2: *Then he showed me Joshua the high priest standing before the angel of the Lord, and Satan standing at his right hand to accuse him. And the Lord said to Satan: The Lord rebuke you, O Satan! The Lord who has chosen Jerusalem.* Here we see clearly that the Lord mm said to the devil: *The Lord rebuke you* m.T. From this it follows that the Lord mm is not one person, but several. But that the other one is Christ is taught by Eusebius in book 5, chapter 27 of his Demonstration, Jerome, Theodoretus and Rupert in their Commentaries on this text. And Theodoretus gives the reason why it is the Son rather than the Holy Spirit who says, *The Lord rebuke you,* because indeed Satan accuses Joshua, the son of Josedech, who functioned as a type of Christ. Hence, since that Joshua (Jesus) by himself could not resist Satan, the Son of God, who is also called Jesus, rebuked Satan for him, and at the same time signified by this accusation that, when he had come in the flesh, he would rebuke the devil, which he did in Matt. 4:10 when he says: *Begone, Satan!*

Someone could respond that in this place the angel, before whom Joshua was standing, is called Lord, and that he said, *The Lord rebuke you.* This is how Benedict Arias Montanus explains it in his Commentary on this text; and his explanation can be confirmed both because in Jude's epistle this word to Satan, *The Lord rebuke you,* is

attributed to the angel Michael, and also because frequently in the Scriptures angels are called by the name of Lord, because they were his legates and they took his place, as is clear in Gen. 18, Exod. 3, Judg. 2 and elsewhere. On the contrary: for, Jude is not talking about this accusation, but about something else that was done by the angel who was contending with the devil over the body of Moses. Also, angels are never given the name of mm but only he who spoke through the angels, who is the true God; or sometimes an angel is called mm not as an angel, but as representing the Lord. But whether in this place the Lord himself is speaking, or an angel representing the person of the Lord, still it is always understood that there are two persons, who are the one numerical Lord. For, if the Lord were only one person, the angel representing that person will not say, *The Lord rebuke you,* but he himself would rebuke him, as being present in the person of the Lord.

The ninth place is Zechariah 12:10: *And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of compassion and supplication, so that they will look on me whom they have pierced.* This text is understood to be about Christ crucified on the cross, and nevertheless the God of Israel is speaking, who alone can pour out on men the spirit of compassion and supplication. And it is not necessary to cite the testimonies of the Fathers. For, in John 19:37 this is said to be fulfilled, when Christ was crucified and pierced with a lance; and moreover, the matter itself proclaims it. For when, I ask, was God the author of grace pierced, unless it was when Christ, the true God and Lord of glory (as Paul says) was crucified? Or, if this is not pleasing, let the adversaries show where and when the Father was pierced, so that he could truly say: *They will look on me whom they have pierced.*

CHAPTER VI

THE THIRD CLASS IS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT

The first testimony is the confession of Peter inspired by the revelation of God the Father in Matt. 16:16: *You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* Here one should note that Peter says that Christ is the true and natural Son of God. And he adds the word "living," because it is proper to living things to generate offspring similar to themselves in nature. And this is confirmed from other places, for in John 3:16 Christ is said to be the only begotten Son. In Rom. 8:3 he is said to be *his own Son.* In 1 John 5:12 he is called *the true Son.* In Col. 1:15 and Heb. 1:2 he is God's *natural Son.* For, he is said to be the image or type of the paternal hypostasis, which does not pertain to an adopted son. Likewise, in the same place he is said to be such a Son so that in reference to him the angels are called servants, who, however, elsewhere are the adopted children of God, and they are such in a special way.

Finally, Christ was accused of saying that he is the Son of God (see John 19:7): *We have a law and by that law he ought to die, because he has made himself the Son of God.* And it is certain that he was not accused because he made himself the adopted or metaphorical Son of God; for, even the Jews said: *We have one Father, even God* (John 8:41). Nevertheless Christ did not deny this accusation, but admitted it as true, and he wished to die in that confession. But if he is the true, proper, only begotten, natural Son, then he was generated from the substance of the Father, but he did not receive a substantial part, because God is indivisible; therefore he received the whole divinity and so he is the one same God with the Father.

The Transylvanian ministers in book 2, chapter 7 and Blandrata in Disputation 6 of Albana respond that Christ is the true and proper Son of God, because he was conceived by the Holy Spirit, and they prove it thus: for in Luke 1:35 it is said: *The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.*

But we reject that: for also Adam, Eve, all the angels, were not generated from the seed of man, but they are the immediate works of God. How, therefore, is the Son said to be only begotten? Secondly, if Christ is the Son of God, because he was conceived in the womb of the Virgin by the action of the Holy Spirit, therefore he can be said to be the Son of the Holy Spirit; but the Scripture nowhere says this, in fact just the opposite; John 15:26, and elsewhere, says that the Spirit proceeds from the Son. Thirdly, this is not to be the natural and true Son; for God did not generate Christ in the womb of the Virgin from his own substance, but only from the substance of the Virgin. Hence Heb. 7:3 says that Christ is without father and without mother, that is, without a father on earth, and without a mother in heaven, as all the Greek and Latin Fathers have explained it.

To that verse in Luke 1:351 say with Ambrose in Sermon 5 on Ps. 119, with Gregory in book 18, chapter 12 on Morality, with Bede and Bernard in their comments on this passage, that the power of the Most High is the Word of God, which descended into the womb of the Virgin, and there took on flesh; and therefore the Son of Mary is called the

Son of the Most High. But it could also be said that the conception by the Holy Spirit is a sign, not a cause, of why Christ is called the Son of God. For it was fitting that, if the Son of God wanted to become a son of man, he should be born only of a Virgin; and if a Virgin is to give birth, she should give birth only to God, as St. Bernard rightly says in Sermon 2 on "Missus est."

Furthermore, there is Jacob Paleologus, who was one of the main doctors of the new Samosatenians; finally in Rome, as we said above, he was converted to the true faith. Not only did he completely reject our argument, but he also turned it back against us with this reasoning: No true Son of God can be the true God; but Christ is the true Son of God; therefore he is not the true God. And he claimed that this syllogism (as I often heard from him) is a true demonstration; and he did so even when I told him that the major proposition of the syllogism is so false that the contrary is true. For, just as a true son of man is a true man, as a true son of a lion is a true lion, and in all other cases there is the same result, so also it is necessary that the true Son of God is the true God.

He responded: indeed according to Philosophy a true Son is of the same nature with his Father, but not according to Scripture. But if the Scripture makes those true sons of God, who are constituted by God as heirs, as is said about Christ in Heb. 1:2, still he cannot be the true God who has been constituted by God as an heir.

You do not expect, I believe, prudent Reader, a refutation of these inept reasons. What then? According to Scripture, was not Seth the true son of Adam, and Isaac of Abraham, and Ruben of Jacob? And were they not of the same nature with their fathers? Then does not Scripture openly say that a man is an heir because he is a son, and not that he is a son because he is an heir? See Rom. 8:17: *And if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ.* And in Heb. 1:2 he says: *He has spoken to us by a Son.* Then he adds: *Whom he appointed the heir of all things.* And you should not understand that he was constituted an heir with a temporal donation, but with an eternal generation.

The second testimony is Luke 1:16-17: *And he will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God, and he will go before them in the spirit and power of Elijah.* The Lord God of Israel in the judgment of all, and especially of the contemporary heretics, is the only true God; but the angel in this place calls Christ the Lord God of Israel. For in this way it is interpreted by Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 11, Ambrose, Bede, Euthymius and others. And it cannot be understood otherwise; for, the words "he will go before them" can be referred only to the Lord God of Israel, who is mentioned immediately before these words. However, it is certain that John went before Christ, not before God the Father. Paul says in Acts 13:23-24: *God has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus, as he promised. Before his coming John had preached a baptism of repentance.* The same point is confirmed by the words: *And he will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God.* For John did not attempt to convert men except to Christ, for he is the one he preached about continuously. Hence we have in John 1:29: *When John saw Jesus he said: Behold, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world.* And immediately after these words Andrew, who was a disciple of John, turned to Christ and followed him.

The third testimony is John 5:18: *This is why the Jews sought all the more to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself*

equal to God. If Christ preached that he is equal to God the Father, therefore he was the true God, eternal and Most High, etc.

But someone could say in objection to this: Christ did not preach that he is equal to God the Father, but the Jews believed that he did, and so the meaning is: the Jews sought to kill him, because he not only broke the Sabbath in their opinion, but also made himself toe Son of God, making himself equal to God, in their opinion.

But it makes little difference whether the Evangelist recounts the opinion of the Jews, or explains what happened. For, as Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine and all the others say in reference to this text, the opinion of the Jews was correct, and the Evangelist narrates that they surely understood very well that Christ said he was equal to God. For, if the opinion of the Jews were false, as Chrysostom rightly points out, certainly Christ or toe Evangelist would have mentioned it lest we be deceived in such an important matter, as he did when the Lord said in John 2:19 that he would rebuild the Temple in three days; there the Evangelist explained that he said this about the temple of his body. And in John 21:23, when from the words of the Lord the disciples thought that John was not going to die, John himself added: *Yet Jesus did not say that he was not going to die, etc.* But Christ not only did not correct the opinion of the Jews, but even confirmed it by saying that he worked the same things which the Father worked, and as the Father raises whom he will, so also does the Son. See Cyril on this whole chapter 5 where he shows that Christ proved in many ways that he is equal to the Father.

The fourth testimony is John 10:30: *I and the Father are one.* All the Fathers use this testimony against the Arians, in order to prove there is one essence of the Father and the Son. The Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 9 and Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana respond that this text is to be understood as the union of love whereby the Father and the Son are one. And they prove this first of all by the authority of Erasmus and Calvin: they could also add Arius and Eunomius. Secondly, they prove it from John 17:11, where it is said about the Apostles: *That they may be one, even as we are one.*

But that this text is to be understood about the unity of essence, I prove first of all with Basil in book 1 (near the end) on Eunomius and Chrysostom in his comments on this text. For Christ, in order to prove that his sheep will not perish, makes this argument: *No one is able to snatch the sheep out of my Father's hand, because he is greater than all* (John 10:29). Therefore no one can snatch my sheep from my hand, because I and toe Father are one. This argument concludes nothing except that "we are one" signifies that it is one and the same hand, that is, the power of the Father and the Son: but if it is the same power, it is certainly also the same essence, because in God the power and the essence are not distinguished.

Secondly, I prove it with Augustine and Chiysostom in their comments on this text. *When they heard this, the Jews took up stones to stone him;* therefore they understood by toe words "we are one" that Christ truly proclaimed that he is one God with the Father; for, they would not have wanted to stone him, if they believed only that Christ said he is one with the Father with a union of will. But since the Jews understood it in this way, and Christ did not correct their idea of him, it is certain that they understood him correctly.

Thirdly, because Christ explained the meaning of "I and the Father are one." For,

since the Jews because of this wanted to stone him, he said: *You say, you are blaspheming because I said I am the Son of God* (John 10:36). Therefore they are not one with a union only of the will, which can exist among those who are not blood relatives, but they are one as the Father and the Son are one, who have the same nature.

But the heretics object to this, and above all Francis David in Disputation 8 Albana, and the Transylvanian ministers in book 2, chapter 7. For, Christ in the following words seems to correct the opinion of the Jews, and to declare that he is God only through grace, for he says this: *Is it not written in your law: I said, you are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came, do you say of him whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world: You are blaspheming, because I said, I am the Son of God?*

I respond, with Hilary in book 7 on the Trinity, that Christ wanted to say: If they can be called gods, who participate in the divinity by a gift of God, because the word of God came to them and they have been constituted by God as leaders of others because of the authority received from him, how much more can I truly be said to be God, even though I am a man, since the Father sanctified me with a singular gift, that is, he made me the Holy of Holies in my conception by uniting the hypostasis of his Word to my human nature? For, because the Jews said: *We stone you for blasphemy, because you, being a man, make yourself God,* the Lord wanted to show not only that he is God, but also ὑπὲρ while existing as a true man, he is also true God. However, he does that by explaining his outstanding and singular sanctification, not through created grace, but through the grace of the hypostatic union; but that his sanctification was such, and that through it he is true God, he proves from his works which are proper to the true God alone. For he says: *If I am not doing the works of my Father, then do not believe me.* And after that: *That you may know and understand that the Father is in me and I am in the Father.* Now that mutual indwelling cannot be understood without an identity of nature. It could also be said, as Chrysostom suggests, that Christ responded to the Jews in two ways. First, even if I were a mere man, I did not for that reason blaspheme by saying that I am the Son of God, since many inferior to me are said in the Scriptures to be gods. Second, after having refuted the calumny, he showed from his works that he is the true God.

Valentinus Gentilis argues from this same text in favor of his error, as Calvin says in his book against Gentilis. For, the Lord does not say: *I and the Father are one person (unus sumus),* but *one thing (unum sumus);* therefore they are of the same nature and divinity, but they are not one person only in God. And he confirms this from John 17:11, where the Apostles are said to be one, just as the Father and the Son are one. There the Apostles are said to be one, and still they are different in number. I respond that Christ could not say, *I and the Father are one (unus sumus),* because then he would have confused the persons. For, it is one thing to say, *I and the Father are one (unus sumus),* or one God, or we are one Spirit; but it is something else to say, *I and the Father are one (unum sumus).* For, that I and the Father are one *(unum sumus),* signifies that they are one being, or one nature, which is not opposed to a plurality of persons. Similarly, we are One God *(Unus Deus)* signifies that they are one in Divinity, and this also is true, and it is not opposed to the plurality of persons; but *Unus sumus* signifies that they are one hypostasis or person, and implies a contradiction.

It is clear that this text does not work for Gentilis, but rather against him. First, because although absolutely and universally *We are one (unum sumus)* does not signify one in number, but one in essence, whether they are one in species or in number; nevertheless in God it signifies necessarily one in number, because, as was proved above, the Divinity is one only in number. Second, the same point is evident, because although Gentilis seems to say that the Father and the Son are one in essence and species, still he is forced to admit that he places an essential difference between the Father and the Son, since he says in theses 22 and 24 that only the Father is immense, but that the Son is less than he because of the manner of his generation, etc.

To the text in John 17:11 Augustine responds in book 2, chapter 12 against Maximinus and in book 3, chapter 22 on Scripture that it is never said of the nature of diverse things that *They are one.* For it is not said that the Apostles and God are one thing, but that they are one, as the Father and the Son are one. And again, as in God they are one, etc., nevertheless this observation, although in some way it is true, does not seem to be necessaiy. For, although the Apostles are of the same nature among themselves, still when it is said by Christ, *That they may be one (unum),* that one does not signify the unity of nature, but the unity of harmony. Moreover, why would it not be possible to pray in the same way that angels and men may be one? And nevertheless the angels differ in species from men. Finally, as was said: *But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him* (1 Cor. 6:17). Why could it not be said: *But he who is united to the Lord becomes one with him?* For, one spirit is one thing: one thing and one are the same thing.

We can say in a better way with Chrysostom in homily 1 on John and with Cyril in book 11, chapter 20 on John that Christ did not will that the Apostles be absolutely one in such a way as the divine persons are one, but he willed that the Apostles through the grace of God be made one from a harmony of will, and in that way imitate the divine persons, who are naturally one by will and consent, and therefore also in essence. For, free agents cannot naturally will the same thing, unless they have the exact same nature. Also, even if absolutely from the fact that the Father and the Son are said to be one, it does not follow that they are one in essence, still in John 17:11 it would follow necessarily because of the reason according to which those words are said there, as we have already shown.

The fifth testimony is in John 14:1: *Believe in God, and believe also in me.* From this Augustine in book 1, chapter 12 on the Trinity and other interpreters on this text deduce that Christ is that true God, whom the Jews worshipped. For, if he himself is not the true God, he cannot arrogate to himself the faith which is due to him alone. And the conjunction "and" should not be a problem here, as if Christ were distinguishing himself from God, and makes himself, as it were, another God; for, the conjunction "and" was added because of the human nature, whereby Christ is distinguished from God. Therefore the meaning is: *If you believe in God, you should also believe in me, whom you see here as a man. For, I am not only man, but I am also that God in whom you believe.* And in the same place: *If you knew me, you would also know the Father.* Likewise, *Philip, he who sees me, sees also the Father.*

Cyril in book 9, chapter 37 in his Commentary on John proves conclusively from this text that Christ is the one God with the Father. For, it cannot be true that Christ cannot

be known, without knowing the Father, unless there is one nature of both of them. One can add the fact that the Apostles knew very well that Jesus is a good and wise man, a prophet, the Christ; and still they hear him say: *If you knew me.* And again: *Have I been with you so long, and yet you do not know me.* It remains, therefore, that they should know that he is the true God, and one with the Father; for they already knew the other things. Finally, Philip asked: *Lord, show us the Father, and we shall be satisfied.* For, the Apostles knew that nothing could satisfy a man for beatitude without the knowledge of the true God, whom they did not doubt was the true God the Father. Therefore, Christ by responding to Philip: *Philip, he who sees me sees the Father,* would not have given a satisfactory answer to his question, unless he had wished to signify that he is the true God, and one with the Father, and that beatitude consists in knowledge of him, as in the knowledge of the Father.

Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana responds that Christ the man was the image of God; and therefore whoever saw Christ, saw God in his image. That is not correct: for, if Francis admitted that Christ is the natural image of God, and of his essence, he would be speaking correctly; but he thinks that the visible and created form of Christ is the image of God: but such an image is very far removed from an exemplar. For nothing created can be perfectly and expressly similar to God, as is said in 1 Kings 8:23: *There is no God like thee.* And also in Isa. 40:16: *To whom then will you liken God?* But anyone who sees such an image, cannot say that he saw the exemplar; indeed, when we see images similar to things, we are not satisfied with that, but we are motivated to see the real thing. But Christ reprimanded Philip, who thought the Father is not sufficiently seen by someone who sees the Son. From this it follows that Christ as God is absolutely the same form and beauty which is proper to the Father.

The sixth testimony is John 16:15: *All that the Father has is mine;* therefore the Son has the essence of the Father. And lest someone say that this is to be understood of things which are outside of God, as we say, everything a man has belongs to his wife, and still often the man has a type of wisdom which his wife does not have; the previous words exclude this meaning, for this precedes: *He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine.* Therefore that is common to the Father and the Son, which the Holy Spirit receives from both of them. What does the Spirit receive from the Son? Doubtless he receives knowledge, for he says: *He will take what is mine and declare it to you.* And before that: *He will not speak on his own authority, but whatever he hears he will speak.* Therefore the knowledge is the same of the Father and the Son: but in God knowledge and essence are the same, as even Aristotle knew; therefore there is one essence of both of them. And all Catholics explain it in this way—Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine, and others commenting on this text.

The seventh testimony is this verse in John 20:28: *My Lord and my God.* Augustine uses this text very effectively in letter 174 to Pascentius. And it is certain that in this place the words "Lord" and "God" signify the true God if Israel, both because in Greek they have the article, and also because Thomas, an Israelite man, did not know any other Lord God except the one about whom it was written: *Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord* (Deut. 6:4). Chiysostom adds in his homily on the Trinity (tome 6) that Thomas,

when he said this, fulfilled the words of Ps. 77:3: *I sought the Lord with my hands, and I was not disappointed.* And there cannot be any doubt but that in that Psalm he is speaking about the true God.

The Nestorians (as can be known from Constantinople II, chapter 12) said that those words, *My Lord and my God,* refer to the Father by way of an exclamation of Thomas, astonished at the resurrection of Christ. But this is a pure corruption of Scripture; for in Greek ὡ is not a sign of exclamation, but the article ὁ precedes the nouns in the Gospel: *Thomas answered him and said to him: My Lord and my God, etc.* What is the meaning of the words "he said to him"? Did he not say it to Christ? For Thomas was speaking with Christ, not with the Father. Concerning this, it is certain that Thomas with those words wanted to confess what he had not sufficiently believed before; but he had always believed that the Father is God; but he had some doubts about the divinity of the Son. Finally, all the Commentators refer these words to Christ's divinity, including even Erasmus, whom the Transylvanians hold in high regard.

The eighth testimony is Rom. 9:5: *To them belongs Christ according to the flesh, who is God over all, blessed for ever.* Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylacζ Origen, Oecumenius, and all others, understand this text in such a way that Christ is said lobe the true God, since nothing is over all things except the sovereign God.

However, Erasmus in his notes on this text seeks to weaken this argument, but he does it with flimsy conjectures. In the first place, he says that the word "God" perhaps does not belong in the text, because Cyprian in book 2, chapter 6 against the Jews, and Hilary in his comments on Ps. 123 cite this text without the word "God." But Cyprian, Aldi and Morelii have the word "God," nor can it be lacking, for in that chapter he wants to prove that Christ is called God, and he cites the places in Scripture where he is called God. Hilary does not cite the whole text, for he omits also "according to the flesh," which however in books 4 and 8 on the Trinity he cites with the word "God." Finally, even without the word "God," the argument is still valid, because if Christ is above all, he is certainly God.

In the second place, Erasmus says that the words, *who is God overall,* can be referred to the Father, if after the words, *to them belongs Christ according to the flesh,* a period is inserted, as he says he read in Chiysostom. But in Chiysostom's Greek I did not find a period, but a comma, which is found in all the Greek and Latin Pauline codices. Then, if because of one period found in the Commentary of Chrysostom, which could have been put there by the landing of a fly, or have crept in by the error of a copyist, should all the Greek and Latin codices be corrected? Finally, if notwithstanding that period, Chiysostom himself quotes these words, *Who is God over all,* to the Son, and all the other authors do the same, with no exception, is it not rash now to want to find a new meaning? For, Erasmus cites absolutely no one in favor of his view, and we, besides all the Commentaries, have also Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 18, Tertullian in his book against Praxeas, Cyprian quoted by Hilary in books 4 and 8 on the Trinity, Ambrose in book 1, chapter 3 on the Holy Spirit and book 1, chapter 5 on Faith, and Augustine in book 3, chapters 3 and 6 against Faustus and book 6, chapter 13 on the Trinity, Cyril in chapter 5 in his book of theses, Gregory in homily 8 on Ezekiel, Athansasius in Oration 2 against

Arius, Victorinus in book 1 against the Arians, Idacius in book 1 against Varimadus, Cassian in book 3 on the Incarnation, and many others.

But what Erasmus says in the same place, namely, that ὃς ὢν was not written by Paul, but ὁ ὤν, is too dull: for who does not know that the prepositive article is often placed for a postpositive, and the conjunction with a participle has the power of a relative? Certainly in Matthew in chapter 6:9 (not to mention other places) we read: Our Father ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, but not ὃς ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

The ninth testimony is had in Gal. 1:11-12: *For I would have you know that the Gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ.* And at the beginning of the letter he says: *Paul an apostle—not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father, etc.* Here St. Paul contrasts Christ with men and therefore teaches that Christ is not a mere man, as the Transylvanians say, but that he is also God, as the Father is God. And he not only contrasts himself with men, but also with angels, and so with all creatures. For he adds: *But even if we, or an angel from heaven, should preach to you a gospel contrary to that which we preached to you, let him be accursed.* Very clearly, therefore, in this place Paul separates Christ from every creature, and on the other hand he joins him with God the Father, and teaches that he is God the creator.

The tenth testimony is Phil 2:6-7: *Who though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave.* Here it seems to be explained clearly that Christ is the true God, since he has the form, that is, the nature of God, and according to that it is not something to be grasped, but a nature equal to God the Father.

But the Arians, Transylvanians and Erasmus object to this; and in order to proceed in an orderly manner, first we must explain the meaning of, *though he was in the form of God.* Secondly, what the meaning is of, *he did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped.* On the first point, Erasmus on this text, and Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana contend that the word "form" in this verse signifies external works, in which the Divinity shines forth. However, they do not explain it in the same way. For, Francis David says that Christ is said to be in the form of God, because he was a certain visible image, in which the invisible God is perceived. And he proves that the form signifies the external species from Deut. 4:12: *You heard the sound of words, but saw no form.* But Erasmus says that Christ was in the form of God, because he did such works exteriorly in order to show openly that he is God. But that the form in this place signifies exterior works he proves first of all, because the form of God is opposed to the form of a slave, which is what Christ is said to have assumed. But Christ did not substantially assume the form of a slave; for he was always the Son, not a slave, but he assumed the form of a slave in an exterior way, because he humiliated himself, and allowed himself to be bound and flogged. Secondly, he proves his point from Ambrose's Commentary.

But the common explanation of all the other Ancients and of more recent authors is that the form of God signifies the essence of God. And the first opinion of Francis David is a pure corruption of the text; for, he has no one on his side, not even Erasmus, because Erasmus proves the divinity of Christ from this text. Furthermore, Paul does

not say Christ is the form of God, but that he is "in" the form of God. Then the opinion of Erasmus is patently false, for, first of all, the Greek word μορφή which occurs here, nowhere in Scripture is used for the external form, or for some work, which is evident from consulting all the occurrences of it. Indeed, Chrysostom on this place says that among all the Greek authors it is never used in this way. But in Aristotle sometimes μορφή is used for an accidental form, but more often for the substantial form, and always for a form that inheres and is intrinsic, never for an external action. What Francis alleges from Deut. 4:17 misses the point, for in Greek it is not μορφή, but ὁμοιώματι, that is, *in the likeness,* as in the Hebrew minn and elsewhere, wherever in Latin it is *forma,* in Greek it is not μορφή, but εἶδος, τύπος, or something else.

Secondly, if to be in the form of God is to do divine works, that is, miracles, then the Apostles also can be said to have been in the form of God, since they performed great miracles.

Thirdly, in this context the form of God is opposed to the form of a slave; but human nature is the form of a slave, not some kind of work. For, Paul, while explaining what it means *to take the form of a slave,* adds this: *Being born in the likeness of men. And being found in human form;* therefore he took on the form of a slave, because he appeared among men as a man, like others also in his external shape. For in this place form does not signify clothing, but shape; for in Greek it is σχήμα, not ἑσθής.

Also the argument of Erasmus does not have any validity. For, Christ, although he is the son, not a servant, if we consider the hypostasis, still by reason of the human nature he is rightly said to be a servant; for since he is God and man, he is said to be equal to the Father, and less than the Father; immortal and mortal; creator and creature: so also he can be called Lord and servant; and he is so designated by Isaiah in chapter 49:3-7. From this place in his comments on Tit. 1 Jerome teaches that Christ is rightly said to be a servant by reason of his humem nature. And there is this in Isa. 42:1 : *Behold my servant, whom I uphold;* Matthew explains about Christ in Matt. 12:18, and in Hebrew it is 'TO, that it really means a servant. Indeed Christ says in John 20:17: *I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.*

Finally, it is a fact that all interpreters of this text, with the exception of Ambrose, concerning whose Commentaries there is no little doubt as to whether they are authentic, by the "form" of God understand the essence of God; and besides the interpreters, those who understand it this way are Athanasius in sermon 4 against Arius, Nazianzen in Oration 5 on Theology, Nyssa in his work on the Sermon on the Mount explaining the First Beatitude, Hilary on Psalm 139 and in his book on the Trinity (beyond the middle), Cyril in book 3, chapters 1 and 2 of his theses, Jerome in his commentary on Tit. 1, Augustine in book 2, chapter 5 against Maximinus. Finally, there is Ambrose in letter 47: *What does it mean,* he said, *to be in the form of God? It means, in the nature of God.* He gives a similar explanation in book 2, chapter 4 of his work on Faith. Hence it is more probable that the Commentaries on the letters were not by Ambrose, although whoever the author was, still he says nothing favorable to the heretics, since he clearly says that Christ is the true God, and equal to the Father.

Regarding the second part of this sentence, *he did not count equality with God a thing*

to be grasped, etc., Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana says that Christ is equal to the Father, because God raised him up to be his own equal. But this is contrary to Scripture, as in Isa. 42:8:*I am the Lord, my glory I give to no other.* And then it is impossible for a creature to be equal to the creator, since it is necessarily finite, temporal, etc. Hence in Disputation 4 the same Francis, seeing that what he had said before is indefensible, teaches that Christ is not equal to the Father in dignity, since he adores the Father, but that he is equal because he has omnipotence communicated to him by God.

But I ask him: How does he have omnipotence, either intrinsically, so that the man Christ is omnipotent, or extrinsically through indwelling, because he has the omnipotent God dwelling within him? If it is in the first way, the prior difficulty remains, because if that man has intrinsically infinite power, then he also has an infinite essence; therefore he is the one God who is also the Father. If it is in the second way, Paul would be saying nothing, for in this way all the justified are equal to the Father, because they have the Father dwelling in them.

Therefore since that explanation is not valid, the Transylvanian ministers in book 2, chapter 6 say that Paul is not saying that Christ is equal to God the Father, but rather the contrary, and they propose this for the meaning: *he did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped,* that is, something to be done so that he would be equal to God: as Erasmus explains this text, and before him the Arian Maximinus, as stated by Augustine in book 2, chapter 5. And they prove this first of all, because the adversative particle "but" seems to indicate that. For it we read this: *Christ rightly thought that he was equal to the Father, but he emptied himself:* what will the meaning be? But if you say: *Christ did not think that his equality was something to be grasped, but on the contrary he emptied himself;* here the meaning is very good.

Secondly, they prove it from Tertullian, who in his book on the Trinity says this: *Although he said that he was God from God the Father, he never compared himself to God the Father, etc.* But on the contrary. For, first of all, all the Fathers previously cited say that Christ is equal to the Father, not because he grasped it, but from his nature. Secondly, the text has that meaning, unless the words are twisted. Thirdly, because if to be in the form of God, is to be in the essence of God, as we said above, Paul could not say that the Son is not equal, since he already had said that he is in the form of God.

But to the comment about the adversative I give this response: the word "but" *(sed),* which in Greek is ἀλλα, has several meanings: for sometimes it has the power of correction, and it is taken in this way by Chrysostom with Theodoretus, Theophylact and Oecumenius; for these men who are masters of the Greek language, say that ἀλλα is a note of correction, and that this is the meaning: *Since Christ was in the form of God, he so thought that equality with God was not to be grasped, that instead he did not hesitate to hide his divinity, and to set aside in some sense the signs of his equality, because he was certain that he could not lose it, since it was natural to him.* They then give the example of a king and a tyrant. For he who knows that he is a true and legitimate king, in no way fears that if he sets aside his purple robes and assumes the clothing of a peasant, either to amuse himself or to be more safe in battle, or for any other reason; in any event, he does not fear that he will lose his kingdom because he has changed his clothing. But a tyrant

who has stolen the royal power, will not dare to appear without the purple and scepter, or will do so only for short space of time, lest if he is seen dressed as a peasant he will not be acknowledged as king, and gradually will lose the kingdom, etc.

The Latin authors agree that it is an adversative, and equivalent to the particle *however,* or *but nevertheless.* Thus Augustine in book 2, chapter 5 against Maximinus, where he gives this as the meaning: *Since he was in the form of God, he did not count it as something to be grasped that he is equal to God, but nevertheless he emptied himself, etc.,* that is, *although he was equal to God, nevertheless he did not dread the form of a servant.* Thus also in the Commentary of Ambrose: *Even though he was equal to God, still he did not defend his equality, but he emptied himself,* that is, *under the pretext of equality with God, which belonged to him naturally, he did not want to refuse the humiliation of his passion and death.*

To the citation from Tertullian I have two things to say: First, that the book on the Trinity, which is attributed to Tertullian, is not really his, but rather Novatian's, as Jerome says in book 2 against the books of Ruffinus and in his book against Novatian. Secondly, I say that the opinion of this author is not opposed to us; for he says that the Son did compare himself with the Father only because of the authority of origin, not because of any difference of nature. For there he says clearly that the Son was in the form of God, because he is in the form of God and above all things, just as the Father is. Nevertheless because he is from the Father, and the Father is not from him, that he was always deferential to the Father. And this is not the opinion of Tertullian only, but also of Hilary in book 9 on the Trinity, of Basil in book 1 on Eunomius, of Nazianzen in book 4 on Theology, and of Cyril in book 2, chapter 3 of his theses; they all explain concerning the Son that he is not only son of man, but also that he is the Son of God—*the Father who is greater than I.* For, they say that the Father is greater by reason of the principle of being, and still that the Son is not less than he because of the identity of nature.

The eleventh place is 1 John 5:7-8: *There are three who give testimony in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit, and these three are one; and there are three who give testimony on earth, the spirit, the water and the blood.* In this place John wants to show that Christ is true God and true man, and therefore he presents divine and human testimonies, for he says: *There are three who give testimony in heaven.* By the phrase "in heaven" he does not understand a heavenly place, but the quality of the testimony; otherwise the angels are also in heaven, and they did not once give testimony to Christ, and nevertheless John places only three witnesses in heaven—the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit. Therefore, through witnesses who are in heaven, divine witnesses are understood, so that they can be distinguished from human and created witnesses. And because of this a little later Paul also says: *If we receive he testimony of men, the testimony of God is greater.* Therefore, as the spirit, the water and the blood are earthly witnesses, and prove the true humanity of Christ, namely, when at the death of Christ the spirit flowed out from his mouth, and water and blood from his side, so also the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit are divine persons, and they give divine testimony about the true divinity of Christ, both elsewhere often, and also in his Baptism and Transfiguration.

But George Blandrata objects to this in Disputation 2 Albana. First, the words, *there*

are three who give testimony in heaven, are not found in any author except Jerome, who was not very modest. Second, it cannot be said about the Spirit, the water and the blood that they are one just as the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit are one; and therefore, just as the Spirit, the water and the blood are not one in number, indeed not even in species, so the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit are not one in number, or in species, but only by an agreement of the will.

I respond that Blandrata is not just a little modest, but that he is veiy shameless, when he says that St. Jerome lacks modesty, especially when he is imitating Erasmus. Not only is Blandrata very shameless, but he is also ignorant, or mendacious when he says that only Jerome has that text. For, those who have the same reading are Heginus in letter 1, Cyprian in his book on the unity of the Church, Idacius in his book against Varimadus, Athanasius in book 1 to Theophilus on the unity of the divine Trinity, the author of the Disputation of the same Athanasius which he had with Arius at the Council of Nicaea, Fulgentius in his book against the Arian objections, and Eugene the Carthusian in his explanation of the Catholic Faith.

But concerning the words, *and these three are one,* it should be noted that these words are not present in many Latin codices, where the text speaks about the 5ρίπζ the water and the blood. For, in the Louvain Bibles 15 codices have a note in the margin that they do not have these words. But the Greek codices do have them, but written differently: for, concerning Father, Son and Holy Spirit they say και αύτοι οί τρεις έν είσιν, *and these three are one;* concerning the Spirit, the water and the blood, και οί τρεις είς το έν είσιν, that is, *and these three tend towards unity.* Here you can clearly see that the spirit, the water and the blood are not one, but only agree concerning one testimony.

The twelfth place is 1 John 5:20: *We are in him who is true, in his Son Jesus Christ This is the true God and eternal life.* But there is only one true God, as is said in John 17:3: *That they know thee, the only true God.* Hence the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 3 say that this is the proper name of the Father, *the true God;* therefore Christ is that same God who is the Father. To this text the Transylvanians respond, the new Samosatenians, in book 2, chapter 4 and 7 and Servetus in book 1 of his work on the Trinity, that Christ is the true God, but temporal, because he received from God the true divinity. But we have already refuted this elsewhere; for, the Divinity cannot be united to a creature, except hypostatically, if it must be said to be the true God. For, it cannot be united to it accidentally, so that it inheres in it intrinsically, as has been pointed out, because then it would depend on the subject; nor can it be united to it substantially, like the soul with the body, and a substantial form with its matter, because then it would be a part of something; and an extrinsic union does not suffice to designate God.

But Servetus objects to this by quoting the words of Rev. 5:12: *Worthy is the Lamb to receive power and divinity.* I respond: some read here not divinity, but wealth, as Primasius reads it, for in Greek it is τόν πλούτον; but the Vulgate edition has also the best meaning. For, by the word "divinity" we can understand the manifestation of divinity, not the divinity itself. Erasmus in his notes on this text wants the word "this is the true God" to be referred to the Father in this way: *That we may be in his true Son, this,* namely, *Father of this Son, is the true God.* But he should have cited at least one author, who explained

it distinctly in this way. For why does not the demonstrative pronoun "this" demonstrate the nearest person, rather than the remote one? This is so especially because in the Greek text before the word "this" immediately preceding is the name of Jesus Christ: και έσμεν έντώ άληθινώ, έν τώ υίώ αύτου Ιησού Χριστώ, ούτος έστιν ό άληθινός θεός.

Then the Fathers explain it as being about the Son. Hilary in book 6 on the Trinity (beyond the middle), after he had cited this text, added after v. 17 the lines: *and this is the true Son of God for us and eternal life, etc.,* where he had cited. *This is the true God and eternal life,* he explains it to be about the Son, since he says that he is eternal life. Jerome in his comments on Isa. 65:16: *He shall swear by God Amen,* he says that not only the Father is God Amen, that is, true God, but also the Son, and he proves it from this text, *This is the true God and eternal life.* Augustine in book 1, chapter 6 on the Trinity said: *And the Son is not only God, but also the true God, which John clearly says in his letter: we know that the Son of God has come and has given us understanding, etc.* This is the true God, etc. Cyril in book 12, chapter 13 of his theses, after he had quoted this text, said this: *What will the heretics say about these word of St. John, in which the Son is clearly called the true God. For, if he is God substantially, then it is not by participation, as is the case with a creature; but the one who is truly God, is God by nature.* Bede and Oecumenius give a similar explanation in the Commentaries on this text.

Formerly the Eunomians, convinced by the evidence of this testimony, admitted, according to Gregory Nazianzen in Oration 3 on Theology, that the Father is true God, and similarly the Son is true God, but in an equivocal way, as the celestial and terrestrial dogs are said equivocally to be dogs, however both of them properly and truly. But it is easy to refute this answer. For, Eunomius is speaking either about a perfect equivocation, or about an analogy of some kind. If it is about a perfect equivocation, such as exists between names of things of the same species, then the Father will not be more God, nor greater God, nor a God prior to the Son, just as Judas Iscariot is not more a man, or a greater man, or a prior man than Jude Thaddeus. Moreover, then there will be several true Gods, as Judas Iscariot and Judas Thaddeus are several true men; but Scripture teaches that there is only one God. If it is about some kind of analogy, either the Father or the Son will not be truly and simply God, just as the painted picture of a man is not simply, truly and properly a man; and a celestial dog is not properly and truly a dog, but it is called that because it is like a terrestrial dog. But Christ is true God, and similarly the Father; therefore the Son is not God only by analogy.

The thirteenth place is John 1:1: *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.* Thus: *All things were made through him.* Three arguments are derived from this passage.

The first is taken from the name of the Word; for the Word or λόγος is the product of the mind, or an idea or concept. And although the concept of the mind in us is not called a son, because it is an accident; still it is very similar to generation and what it produces. For, the understanding mind takes the place of the father and the object is the mother; the species is the quasi matter of the generation, which the matter supplies. Hence from the complex of mind and object, with the help of the species, the idea or word is produced. However, it should be noted that, in God, as even Aristotle teaches, the knower, the thing

known and the knowing are the same, and the intelligible species, with the exception of the mutual relations of the producer and what is produced. From this it follows that the Word of God necessarily is the same with God, that is, of the same exact substance and nature. But Christ is the Word of God, for John says: *And the Word became flesh;* Christ has the same exact nature as the Father.

The second argument is taken from the fact that the Word is called God. For, in this place the Word of God, which is Christ, is called God expressly, and doubtless he is the same God as the Father. For, John in almost the whole chapter, at the beginning of the following sentence always repeats what he had placed at the end of the preceding one: *In the beginning,* he says, *was the Word;* then he adds: *And the Word was with God.* There you see that the same name is placed at the end of the first sentence, and at the beginning of the second; thus also because in the second he had said: *And the Word was with God.* In the third he says: *And the Word was God.* There he is said to be the same God with whom the Word was, and he whom the Word himself was. The same point can be observed in what follows: *In him was life, and the life was the light of men. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it, etc.*

The third argument is in these words: *All things were made through him.* For hence it follows, as Augustine says in book 1, chapter 6 on the Trinity, that the Word was not made, and therefore is not a creature, and so that he is one God with the Father; for nothing else exists except God and his creatures.

But the Transylvanian ministers respond in book 2, chapters 3 and 11 that the Word in this place signifies Christ the man, and that he is called the Word, because he proclaimed the words of God to us; and they try to prove this. For, when it is said: *And the Word became flesh,* in Greek it is ἐγένετο, which means "became" or "was," as is manifest from parallel texts. For, in this chapter it is said: *There was a man sent from God.* The Greek verb is ἐγένετο; similarly in Luke 1:5: *In the days of Herod there was a priest.* And in Luke 24:19: *Who was a prophet*—the verb is always ἐγένετο. Therefore the meaning is not that the Word became man through the incarnation, but the Word, about whom so many remarkable things are said, is nothing other than the flesh, that is, a certain man; just as John is said to be the voice, not that he is the incarnate voice, but that he is the voice of one crying in the wilderness.

To the second argument Francis David in Disputation 9 Albana and the Transylvanian ministers in book 2, chapter 11 respond by saying that Christ is rightly called God, but not the same one with the Father; for, it is said that *the Word was with God,* that is, the Father. But since the next words are, *and the Word was God,* if the word "God" is taken in the same way, it would mean that the Son is the Father.

And to the expression, *All things were made through him,* they respond that it is to be understood as the restoration accomplished by Christ, which is also usually said to be a new creation, as in 2 Cor. 5:19: *If any one is in Christ, he is a new creature; the old has passed away, behold, the new has come.* Eph. 1:10: *To unite all things in Christ, things in heaven and things on earth.* And in chapter 2:10: *For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works.* And Ps. 51 : *Create in me a clean heart, O God.* But they are in error: First of all, the opinion of the Word is like the error of Eunomius, whom

Cyril refuted in book 1, chapters 4 and 7 on John, for he said: the Word, which is Christ, is not something eternal in God, or subsisting, but it is something created; but he is called the Word, because he is similar to, and the quasi image of an intimate word, and because, having listened to God's word, he proclaimed it to us.

Now both errors will be refuted. First, from what follows, because this Word, which became flesh, was God, and God the creator of all things; therefore he was not created. Second, because this Word was in the beginning with God, before the world came to be, and in Scripture he is never said to have been made. Third, because if Christ is the image of the eternal Word, and of the internal, which is in God, he should not have said in John 10:30, *I and the Father are one,* but *I and the Word are one;* nor should he have said in John 14:9, *He who sees me, sees the Father,* but he sees also the Word. There is more on this by Cyril in the cited place.

But to the argument taken from the word ἐγένετο, I respond that the word itself is ambiguous and signifies both *to be* and *to become.* Hence in John 2:1 we read, *There was a marriage,* γάμος ἐγένετο; and in chapter 1:10, *the world was made through him,* ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτου ἐγένετο. And below (John 2:9), *the water now become wine,* ὑδωρ οἰνον γεγενημένον, but in this text it means *to become,* not *to be.* First of all, it is clear from what was said: for, if the Word existed before the creation of the world, certainly it existed before the flesh. For, the flesh is also one of the creatures; therefore the Word was not flesh, but became it afterwards when he assumed flesh. Secondly, because if John had wanted to signify *to be,* and not *to become,* he would not have said ἐγένετο, but γίνεται, that is, he would not have said *he became,* but *he is,* or *he was.* For "he became" is said only about that which now is not; but Christ is also flesh right now. Thirdly, because the Greek Fathers—Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Euthymius—knew very well the power of the Greek word, and nevertheless they all explain "he became" *(factum est),* as the version of Erasmus also has it and also as it is in the Bible of Vatablius, versions to which the adversaries are wont to attribute much authority.

With regard to the second argument, we already said that John in that chapter is wont frequently to repeat twice the same word at the end of one sentence, and at the beginning of the next one. Therefore, the name "God" is stated twice with the same signification, and the meaning is, *the Word was with God,* that is, *with the Father who is God, and God was the Word,* that is, *and the same God was also the Word;* or, as others say, who make "God" the predicate, and the Word the subject, *and the Word was that same God.* This is so notwithstanding that in the phrase "with God" the Greek article is used, τόν θεόν, but here, *and God was the Word,* there is no article before the word "God"; hence Origen aigued that the Father is greater than the Son. For, as Chrysostom says in homilies 3 and 5 on John, often the name "God" used for the Father does not have the article in Greek, as in this chapter: *There was a man sent from God* (John 1:6), and after that: *No one has ever seen God* (v.19); sometimes the word "God" used for the Son has the Greek article, as in 1 John 5:20, *This is the true God.* And also in Titus 2:13, *the appearing of the glory of our great God.*

But regarding the words, *All things were made through him,* I say first of all that the explanation of the adversaries is so new that it never occurred to any of the Ancients, as

is clear from the works of Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine, Theophylact, Bede, Rupert and Euthymius in their commentaries on John. I say secondly that Scripture should not be explained metaphorically at will, but then only when Scripture itself offers the occasion, otherwise we could pervert all Scripture, and for the same reason we could say that in Gen. 1 creation is not described, but the renewal of things. The texts cited in opposition to this are not a valid objection, for in them there is always an explicit mention of renewal, as is clear from reading those texts. Here, however, it is simply stated: *All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made.* I say thirdly: although this place may be open to a twofold meaning, still the adversaries cannot prove that it should be explained in terms of renovation rather than to be about the first creation; for, the reasons they give have no value.

First, they prove it is not dealing with creation, because Christ had not yet been born, when the world was created. But we deny that Christ then had not been born from God the Father, although he had not yet been born of his mother; but when the adversaries assume what must be proved, are they not begging the question? Second, they offer a proof because the Scriptures passim attribute the work of creation to the Father; but they attribute it not to the Father alone, but also to the Son, as in Prov. 8:30: *Then I was beside him, like a master workman.* And in John 1:10: *And the world was made through him.* They prove it thirdly because John in this place, after he had said, *all things were made through him, and without him was not anything made,* immediately he limits it by saying, *that was made,* as if he were to say: not absolutely everything was made through Christ, but only all those things, which pertain to his office, and which were made through him. But this would be a ridiculous restriction; for it would be as if he were to say, *all things were made through him, which were made through him;* but John does not say this, but *without him was not anything made that was made,* that is, *there is no thing which was made, and was not made through him.* John adds this because of the Holy Spirit, lest he be thought to be included among all the things which were made through the Word. You can add to this that the reading followed by Augustine is more probable, so that the words "that was made" *(quod factum est)* do not pertain to the previous sentence, but to the following one in this way: *All things were made through him, and without him was not anything made. What was made, in him was life, and the life was the light of men.* With this reading the argument of the adversaries is clearly demolished. Therefore because of such flimsy and false reasons, is the common explanation of the Fathers to be abandoned?

Fourthly, I say that this passage is explained a little later when he says: *He was in the world, and the world was made through him, yet the world knew him not.* For here we have that the world was made by Christ, and it did not know Christ; but if the making of the world was not creation but renovation, the expression "the world knew him not" would be false, because the renovation takes place through Faith and the knowledge of Christ. They respond obstinately that this is the meaning: *He was in the world,* that is, *the man Christ living among men; and the world did not know him,* that is, *and those men in the beginning did not know him; and the world was made through him,* that is, *and still he enlightened men, and made them new creatures.*

But I beg to differ. For, the adversaries change the order of the words; for they say

first that the world did not know him, and then that it was made. But the Evangelist says first, *the world was made though him;* then he notes its ingratitude, saying: *and the world knew him not.* Moreover, the world in the Scriptures either signifies the substance of heaven and earth, as in Eccles. 3:11, *he has put eternity into man's mind;* or, wicked men as lovers of the world, as in John 12:31, *now shall the ruler of this world be cast out.* John 17:9, *I am praying for them; I am not praying for the world;* therefore when it says, *the world was made through him,* it signifies either the substance of heaven and earth, as all the Fathers explain it; or the meaning will be, *through Christ men became wicked,* which is a huge blasphemy; for, by receiving the world for the wicked, Christ does not make, but he destroys the world in order to make a new creature.

The fourteenth place is found in Col. 1:16-17: *In him all things were created, in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominations or principalities or authorities—all things were created through him and for him. He is before all things, and in him all things hold together.* This place is clearer than the previous one, for there is an explanation of what all those things are, which Christ created and conserves. And they are said to be absolutely all terrestrial and heavenly things, even the highest angels. From this it follows that Christ is not a creature, but the true God.

However, the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 12 and Francis David in Disputation 7 Albana respond that in that whole chapter creation is called spiritual renewal, which was accomplished by Christ. First, they it prove it, because Procopius explained it in this way in his comments on Genesis 1 on page 39. Second, because Paul does not say that heaven and earth were created through Christ, but those things that are in heaven and earth, that is, angels and men, whom Christ is said to have created, because he pacified them and reconciled them among themselves.

But on the contrary. First, all the interpreters understand this passage to be about the first creation; hence the adversaries, after having consulted all the libraries, could find only one author, Procopius, who was more an orator than a theologian. He did not interpret this letter, but in passing while writing about Genesis, he borrowed for his thesis one sentence from this letter, without taking into consideration what precedes it and what follows. However, lest they rejoice that they had found one companion of their error, when he explained the verse: *Let us make man in our image, after out likeness,* he sharply attacked those who deny that there are three persons of the same essence. And shortly thereafter he says: *Christ assumed human flesh so that he might restore and heal the man whom he had created.* Therefore, since a little after that he says that all things were created through Christ according to the Apostle's letter to the Colossians, and he explains "united" *(instaurata),* he wants to say that Christ united what he had previously created.

Second, I prove my point from what preceded; for, he had said that Christ is the first-bom of all creation, that is, bom from the Father before any creature came to be, as Chrysostom rightly explains it. Then in order to prove this, he adds: *In him all things were created, etc.,* but if "created" signifies "established," Paul is proving nothing. For it does not follow—*he restored all creatures,* therefore he himself was before all creatures. For how often do architects restore buildings, which were constructed many years before they were bom? Therefore, since Paul rightly proves that Christ is the first-born before

every creature, it is not necessary to understand, *he established all things,* that is, *restored* them, *but simply he created them.*

Third, from what follows, for after Paul had said "all things were created through Christ," he adds other praises of Christ, saying that he is the Head of the Church, and the first-born from the dead, and through him all things are reconciled, and through his cross the angels live in peace with men. Therefore, if we do not take Paul as a careless speaker, who always repeats the same thing, it is necessary to admit that in the first part of the chapter he is talking about creation, but in the second part about restoration.

Fourth, I prove my point from the whole context. For, he says that all things were created through Christ, also thrones and dominations; but the angels were not restored by Christ, because they did not become old through sin. Indeed they are said to live in peace with men, but "to pacify" does not mean "to establish and to create," and no example of this can be quoted from Scripture.

The text in Eph. 1 is not opposed to this; there all things in heaven and on earth are said to be recapitulated through Christ. For, the Greek word ἀνακεφαλαιουσθαι means to *recapitulate,* and to sum up or unite, and the meaning is: *God wanted to unite angels and men under one Head, Christ.* But if we also accept the Latin word "unite" *(instaurare)* in its proper meaning, then the sense will be: *God wanted to restore in heaven through Christ* not the angels themselves, who did not need restoration, but the number of the angels lessened by the fall of the demons, as Augustine explains in chapters 61 and 62 of the Enchiridion, where he says that Christ did not die for the angels; and in chapter 108 where he says that men would not have needed the work of a Mediator and his blood, if Adam had not sinned. But here the angels are said to have been established and created through Christ; therefore he is talking about a true creation, not about a restoration.

The fifteenth place is Heb. 1:2 where it is said about the Son: *Through whom also he created the world.* And below that: *And thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of thy hands.* Here we have very clearly what the adversaries required in the two previous places, namely, that Christ made the heavens and the earth, and therefore that he is not a creature, but the creator one with the Father. The Transylvanian ministers in book 2, last chapter, and Francis David in Disputation! Albana respond that the word "world" is to be understood as the new world, that is, the restoration of the human race. But that is not correct. For Paul, explaining in chapter 11 what it means to make the world, says: *By Faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God, so that what is seen was made out of things which do not appear.* This certainly cannot be understood, except to be about the first creation of the heavens. See chapter 4 above.

CHAPTER VII

THE FOURTH CLASS IS FROM THE NAMES OF THE TRUE GOD

The first divine name is God, from which a strong argument can be derived. For, Scripture is not accustomed absolutely to use the word "God," except for the true God, as Irenaeus notes in book 3, chapter 6, where he says: *Therefore neither would the Lord, nor the Holy Spirit nor the Apostles, have ever named as God, definitely and absolutely, him who was not God, unless he were truly God.* And in chapter 8: *This calumny, then, of these men, having been quashed, it is clearly proved that neither the prophets nor the Apostles did ever name another God, or call [him] Lord, except the true and only God.*

Hence Erasmus in his commentary on Eph. 5 says that the Father is to be understood whenever God is named absolutely. This statement of Erasmus is false, as will now be shown; but it helps to take notice of his testimony, in order to establish, even with the testimony of an adversary, that the word "God" used absolutely pertains to the true God alone. And without the testimony of Irenaeus or Erasmus the matter cries out by itself: for, since Scripture repeats nothing more often than there is only one God, how would it not contradict itself, if it named absolutely not only the true God, but also some other God? Now this name is attributed absolutely to Christ in Isaiah 9:6: *His name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, etc.* John 20:28 where Thomas says to Christ: *My Lord and my God!* Acts 20:28: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God which he obtained with his own blood.* Rom. 9:5: *Christ, who is God over all.* Rev. 4:8: *The Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come.* 1 John 3:16: *By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us.* Therefore, how is he not the true God, who so often in the Scriptures is called God absolutely? And how, I ask, does the fact that Christ is said so absolutely to be God, have coherence with these words of Exod. 20:3: *You shall have no other gods before me;* and 1 Cor. 8:6: *For us there is one God,* if Christ is not one God with the Father?

Another name, and indeed one most proper to the true God, is mm which in Greek is called τετραγάμματον (Tetragrammaton). Thus we read in Exod. 15:3

mrr w which our translator renders as *his name is Omnipotent.* But in Hebrew it is not really "omnipotent," but a name that is ineffable. The Transylvanians also are so convinced that this name pertains to the true God alone, that in book 2, chapter 7 they say that this name is proper to the Father; but the other names, like Elohim, Sadat, Adonai and others are also sometimes attributed to Christ, to the angels, and to other created things. Therefore let us prove that this name, which is proper to the true God alone, is fitting for Christ. Jerome in chapter 23:5 says this: *I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely.* And after that: *And this is the name by which he will be called: the Lord is our righteousness* υρτχ ΙΠΙΡ; no one denies that this is to be understood of Christ.

But the Rabbis respond that it does not mean in this place that the name of the Christ will be ΊΠΗ, but that at the time of Christ, and because of Christ himself men will know that the Lord God is our righteousness; as in Exod. 17:15: *And Moses built an altar and*

called the name of it, The Lord is my banner. In Hebrew that Lord is ΠΙΠ' and in Ezek. 48: *And the name of the city henceforth shall be, The Lord is there* ΠΠΠΙ naw.

But this is easily refuted. For it is indeed true that Christ was not called as it were with the proper name of, *The Lord is our righteousness;* nevertheless, from this text it is deduced that Christ is truly mm, for about him it is said: *The Lord is our righteousness,* not about the Father; for, he is the one who made satisfaction to the divine justice for us. Hence in Isa. 53:11 it is said: *By his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous.* And in 1 Cor. 1:30: *Whom God made our wisdom and our redemption.* Moreover, neither the altar, nor Jerusalem are called simply: nw; Christ is called mm in Isa. 40:3: *A voice cries in the wilderness: prepare the way of the Lord.* Since that "Lord" in Hebrew is mm and these words are to be understood of John the Baptist who prepared the way for Christ, all the Evangelists recount the same thing (Matt. 3, Mark 1, Luke 1, John 1), and Christ is named similarly in many places in Isaiah, Zechariah, and the Psalms, as we explained in classes 1 and 2 of these arguments.

Furthermore, this name mm is taken from the words in Exod. 3:14,

mnx nw mm* *I will be who I will be,* or, as our translator renders is, *Iam who Iam.* The by adding the letter formative of a proper name, that is, the Hebrew letter yodh, the name becomes mm and signifies properly the one who is the fount of being, and since he does not have his being from another, he gives it to all things so that they may exist. Accordingly, some rightly teach that this name, if it is to be expressed in any way, it is expressed better through the word *Ihie,* that is, *he will be;* for thus the word mm can be read better than by the word *Jehovah,* which was invented just recently. But we see that what this name signifies is said about Christ; therefore the name itself is suitable for him. About Christ it is said in Rev. 1,4 and 11: *Who is, who was, who is to come.* And in John 13:19: *I tell you this now, before it takes place, that when it does take place you may believe that I am he.* Finally, in the LXX the word κύριος is always used to translate this name, and in the Vulgate of Jerome it is *Dominus* (Lord). Then the Evangelists absolutely call Christ κύριος or Lord, and he gives the same name to himself in Matt. 21:3: *You shall say, because the Lord has need of them.* And in John 13:13: *You call me Teacher and Lord; and you are right, for so Iam.*

The Most High. This name belongs to the only true God, Ps. 83:18: *You alone are the Most High over all the earth.* And the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 3 say that this is the name whereby the Father, who alone is the true God, is distinguished from the Son. This same thing long ago was said by the Arians, according to Jerome in his commentary on Ps. 87. But this same name is attributed to Christ by David in Ps. 87: *This one and that one were born in her, for the Most High himself will establish her.* For, Jerome, Augustine and other exegetes understand this to be about the Son. Zechariah in Luke 1:76 applies the same name to Christ, according to Bede in his Commentary, and the words themselves quite clearly say this: *And you, child, will be called the prophet of the Most High; for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways.* There John is said to be the prophet of the Most High, because he will go before him to prepare his ways; but he went before Christ, not before anyone else, as is well known.

Furthermore: how was *a name which is above every name* given to Chris ζ as Paul

says in Phil 2:9, if he cannot be called "the Most High"? Finally, the same Paul when he writes in Rom. 9:5: *From whom is Christ, who is God over all,* what else does in mean but that Christ is the Most High God? For he is not above everything, unless he is the Most High.

Invisible. This name is more or less proper to the true God. For, although in the Creed we say that God is the maker of all things visible and invisible, still in the Scriptures this name is almost not used except for God. For example, in 1 Tim. 1:17: *To the King invisible, the only God, be honor and glory.* And in chapter 6:16: *Who dwells in unapproachable light.* Hence also the Transylvanians attribute this name to the Father alone in book 2, chapter 5, as did formerly the Arians according to Augustine in book 3, last chapter, against Maximinus. And truly only God is invisible, because he cannot be seen, unless he manifests himself. For, the angels, although to us they are invisible, still they cannot hide themselves from other angels and from God. But the Son is simply invisible like the Father. For, it is said in Matt. 11:27: *No one knows the Son except the Father, and no one know the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.* And in Col. 1:15 it is said: *He is the image of the invisible God.* For although that word "invisible" is in the genitive case, as it is found in the Greek, still he is said to be the image of the invisible God, because the image itself is invisible; it is like an exemplar, and therefore like what is had in Rev. 19:12-13: *He has a name inscribed which no one knows but himself... and the name by which he is called is the Word of God.* Therefore the Word of God is something invisible, since only he, who is the Word of God, knows what it is, but the Father and the Holy Spirit are not excluded, since they have with the Word the same essence and knowledge.

Another name proper to the true God is "the God of glory," or also "the King of glory." For the words found in Acts 7:2: *The God of glory appeared to our father Abraham,* all authors understand to be about the God of Israel, but in 1 Cor. 2:8 it is said of the Son: *If they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory.* And there is this in Ps. 23:7: *Lift up your heads, O gates! and be lifted up, O ancient doors! that the King of glory may come in.* Justin in his dialogue with Trypho explains this as referring to the Messiah; Jerome does the same in his comments on Zech. 2 and Ambrose in book 4, chapter 1 on Faith. Likewise Augustine and others on this verse of the Psalm.

The title "King of kings and Lord of lords" is attributed to the true God alone. For example in 1 Tim. 6:15: *The only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords.* But about the Son it is said in Rev. 17:14: *The Lamb will conquer them, for he is Lord of lords and King of kings.* And in chapter 19:16: *On his thigh he has a name inscribed, King of kings and Lord of lords.* Finally, the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 say that God the Father is said to be one, true, alone, great, the Father of all things. For, in Deut. 6:4 h is said: *The Lord our God is one Lord.* And in John 17:3: *That they know thee the only true God.* Deut. 32:39: *See now that I am he,* namely, *the Lord.* Job 36:26: *Behold, God is great, and we know him not.* Mal. 2:10: *Have we not all one father?*

But all of these things are also said about the Son. See 1 Cor. 8:6: *For us there is the one Lord, Jesus Christ.* And also 1 John 5:20: *This is the true God.* In the letter of Jude 4: *Our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.* However, the Transylvanians so explain and

distort this text that they refer the phrase "Our only Master" to the Father; and then the expression "and Lord, Jesus Christ" to the Son. But the nature of the Greek language is opposed to this; for, there is only one article for the two names: τόν μόνον δεσπότην θέον και Κύριον ήμών Ίησοῦν. But names joined together with one article cannot be referred to two persons. Tit. 2:13: *Awaiting our blessed hope, the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ.*

The Transylvanians following Erasmus refer that "great God" to the Father. But here also one article joined to two names cannot signify two persons: του μεγάλου θεού και σωτήρος. Therefore Chrysostom, Jerome, and others apply it to the Son alone, since they saw that the Greek sentence does not allow for another meaning. Moreover, we are not waiting for the Father to come, but the Son. Paul, however, says that we are waiting for the coming of the glory, that is, the glorious coming (for this is the Hebrew expression) of the great God; therefore the Son is the great God. Finally, in Isa. 9:6: *For to us a child is born, etc... and his name will be called Wonderful Counselor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father;* Christ therefore is the Father of all of us. Hence in John 14:18 we have: *I will not leave you orphans.* And in John 13:33 he calls the Apostles little children. Therefore since all the names of the true God are attributed to Christ, Christ is absolutely the true God.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FIFTH CLASS IS FROM THE ATTRIBUTES

The main attributes of God are first, his Eternity. Gen. 21:33: *There he called on the name of the eternal God.* And in Rom. 16:26: *According to the command of the eternal God.* And 1 Tim. 6:16: *Who alone has immortality.* The second attribute is Immensity. Ps. 145:3: *Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised, and his greatness is unsearchable.* Jer. 23:24: *bo I not fill heaven and earth?* The third is Power. 1 Tim. 6:15: *Who alone is powerful, etc.* The fourth is Wisdom. Rom. 16:27: *To the only wise God.* The fifth is Goodness. Luke 18:19: *No one is good but God alone.* The sixth is Majesty, which deserves supreme worship. Deut. 6:13 and Matt. 4:10: *You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.* And almost all the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 attribute these word to the Father alone. Therefore if we show that these words are suitable for the Son, then it will have been proved that he is the true God, and that he is one with the Father.

Therefore, Eternity is attributed to the Son in Prov. 8:23: *Ages ago I was set up.* For here Wisdom is speaking, but not the essential wisdom, which is completely the same with the essence of God; for, that wisdom is not generated; but it says this: *Before the mountains had been shaped... I was brought forth* (v. 25). The wisdom speaking here was not created, for nothing created is eternal. Moreover, this wisdom distinguished itself from creatures, saying: *The Lord possessed me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old.* Therefore wisdom necessarily is generated, that is, the Son, about whom Paul says in 1 Cor. 1:24: *Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God.*

To this place Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana, Blandrata in Disputation 6 and Hungarian ministers respond that the book of Proverbs is not canonical; but this is a sign of very crass ignorance. For, concerning this book there has never been any doubt, neither for Jews nor for Christians, as is clear from the Galeato Prologue of Jerome; the adversaries have been deceived by the fact that Wisdom and Sirach are not accepted by the Jews, nor by the Lutherans. For they think that there is the same reason for this book *nd for the others, since they all present almost the same argument, and they are usually attributed to the same Solomon.

In addition to this text we have another one in Micah 5:2: *But you, O Bethlehem ^phrathah, who are little to be among the clans of Judah, from you shall come forth for me me who is to be ruler in Israel, whose origin is from of old, from ancient days.* The Scribes >f the Jews also understood this text to be about Christ (see Matt. 2:6).

Francis David in Disputation 2 responds that the days of eternity are called those first ix days of the world, because of a continual succession; but the Christ is said to come orth then, because at that time the promise of the Christ was made to Adam. But Jerome, lieodoretus, Rupert, and all the other interpreters explain this text as being about the temal generation of Christ; that is also the opinion of Valutablus, to whom the adversaries 'em to give much credence. Furthermore, without giving any reason they say that the ays of eternity are called those first days because of succession; but they cannot prove lis either by authority, or by an example, or by any reason. Likewise, as in those words,

he shall come forth from you, a true nativity is signified, but not any promise, so also in the words, *whose origin is from of old, from ancient days,* a true nativity should be signified; for there is the same word in both expressions, both in the Latin text and in the Hebrew.

Another place is John 1:1: *In the beginning was the Word.* Now what does it mean: *In the beginning was the Word,* except that the Word did not begin to be, but always was?

The Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 11 respond that the phrase "in the beginning" does not mean the beginning of the creation of things, but the renewal which was accomplished by Christ. Therefore, they say that the meaning of this text is: *In the beginning of the renewal of the Church, the Word,* that is, *Christ the man, was indeed in the world, because he had already been born of Mary, but he was with God, because he was hidden from men, and known only to God, until he was manifested by John.* But the following words are opposed to this explanation, *all things were made through him.* We have already dealt with this matter above.

Another place is John 8:58, where the Lord says: *Before Abraham was Iam.* This text is not usable against the Arians, but it is against the Samosatenians and the Transylvanians, who say that Christ did not exist before Mary. Hence Francis David responds in Disputation 4 that Christ did not really exist before Abraham, but only as a type or figure, and in various promises of God about sending him. But Christ does not respond to the matter in this way; for, the Jews had said: *You are not yet fifty years old, and have you seen Abraham?* The Lord said to them: *Before Abraham was, I am,* that is, *I saw Abraham, because before he was born, I was.* And certainly if he was hidden there only in figure, he did not see Abraham.

Besides these places there are some others, to which they give no response. One is John 17:5: *Father, glorify thou me in thy own presence with the glory which I had with thee before the world was made.* But Scripture is accustomed to describe eternity with the words, *before the world was made,* or before the foundation of the world, as is clear from Eph. 1:4: *He chose us before the foundation of the world.* And John 17:24: Km *loved me before the foundation of the world.* And 1 Pet. 1:20: *He was destined before the foundation of the world.* Another is Heb. *13; He has neither beginning of days nor end of life.* Another is Heb. 13:8: *Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever,* that is, *he always was, always is and always will be,* which is repeated often in the book of Revelation in chapters 1,4 and 11—*who is, who was and who is to come.* Finally, in 1 John 5:20 there is this: *This is the true God and eternal life.* Certainly, if Christ is eternal life, he cannot not have existed, but he is also eternal and therefore the true God.

Immensity is attributed to the true God. Bar. 3:25: *It is great and has no bounds; it is high and unmeasurable.* And shortly after that: *This is our God, and no other can be compared to him.* And after that: *Afterward she appeared upon earth and lived among men.* From this passage Augustine in book 3, last chapter, against Maximinus proves that the Son is immense. This is so notwithstanding the fact that the prophet seems to be speaking about a great place of God, not about God himself, because he precedes it with this: *O Israel, how great is the house of God! And how vast the territory that he possesses!* And this follows immediately: *It is great and has no bounds.* For, as Theodoretus points out in his Commentaiy, he is not speaking about a material place, but the spiritual place of

ihe saints, which is the same God himself; nor about some finite possession, but about the possession of the infinite good, which is God himself; otherwise it would be false that the possession of God is immense, and that it does not have an end.

Another place is John 3:13: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven.* If Christ (for he calls himself the Son of man) was in heaven, when he was speaking on earth, therefore there was another nature in Christ besides his human nature, which was perceived by the eyes of mortals, namely a divine nature, which is immense, and fills both heaven and earth.

Another place is Matt. 18:20: *Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* Who does not conclude immensity from this? For, it is necessary for him to be at the same time in heaven, and on earth, and in all provinces and regions, who is present wherever some people are gathered together in the name of Christ.

Power, or rather omnipotence, is attributed often to the Son of God in the book of Revelation. For example in 1:8: *I am the alpha and the omega, says the Lord, who is and who was and who is to come.* And 4:8: *Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty, who was and is and is to come.* And 11 : *We give thanks to thee, Lord God Almighty, who is, and who was, and who is to come.*

But the Arians raise an objection to the words in John 5:19: *The Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing.* I respond with Nazianzen in book 4, chapter 3 on Theology and with Ambrose in book 4, chapter 3 on Faith that with these words it is meant only to signify that the power of the Son is from the Father, and that it is the same as the power of the Father. For, it is not said: the Son cannot do anything unless the Father commands it, or assists, but unless he sees the Father doing it. Therefore he adds immediately: *For whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise.* Therefore he does all the same things, but the Son sees the Father doing them, or he is said to learn from the Father, because the knowledge of the Son is from the Father, not however by teaching, but by generation. For, it is the same thing for God to know, and to be; and therefore it is the same thing for the Son of God to receive wisdom, and to receive essence.

The Transylvanians object to the statement in Matt. 28:18: *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.* For from that it seems to follow that Christ has a certain omnipotence not from all eternity, not from his nature, but from a gift of grace given in time. I respond: that is said about Christ inasmuch as he is man, not as God. For, since he is both God and man, as God he has omnipotence from eternity and from his nature; as man, he received the supreme power from God in time, and from a gift of grace. Or, if you prefer to speak about Christ the man, not as a man but absolutely, then the man Christ received omnipotence in time, but from a gift of uncreated grace, namely, of the hypostatic union, and therefore not first of all after the resurrection, but from his very conception that man Christ was omnipotent and God. For what he says in Matthew 28:18 after the resurrection, *all authority has been given to me,* he had said before the resurrection in John 13:3: *Knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands.*

Wisdom is attributed to the Son so often that by the theologians it is called his own property. Here are some examples: 1 Cor. 1:24 *Christ the wisdom of God.* Col. 2:3: *In Christ are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* John 21:17: *Lord, you know*

everything.

But the Arians attack the verse in Matt. 24:36: *But of that day no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only.* I respond that this is said about Christ as man, as the Fathers teach, like Ambrose in chapter 17 on Luke and Cyril in book 9, chapter 4 on his theses. Therefore this text offers nothing favorable to the Arians. But how Christ the man is said not to have known that day, we will explain in the question about the knowledge of Christ's soul.

You will say: in this place the Father only is said to know; therefore the Son is also excluded as God. I respond with Augustine in book 3, chapter 13 against Maximinus that the word "only" does not exclude the persons who are of the same nature with the Father, but created things, unless he is talking about an action proper to the Father by reason of his person, not by reason of his essence. Therefore since knowledge belongs to the Father inasmuch as he is God, but not because he is the Father, then the Son or the Holy Spirit is not excluded, since only the Father is said to know something.

The Transylvanians insist: for in Rom. 16:27 when it is said: *To the only wise God be glory for evermore through Jesus Christ,* that "to the only wise God" seems to be said about the Father only. For, in that place the Father is clearly distinguished from the Son, since "through Jesus Christ" is added. Augustine responds to this in book 3, chapter 13 against Maximinus that "to the only wise God" is said about the whole Trinity, to which honor is given through Christ. For, since Christ is both God and man, as God he receives honor with the Father and the Holy Spirit, but as man he gives it. And he gave it when he preached the Trinity to the world, and ordered all nations to be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.

Goodness is attributed to the Son in Wisdom 7:24-27: *For wisdom is more mobile than any motion; because of her pureness she pervades and penetrates all things. For she is a breath of the power of God, and a pure emanation of the glory of the Almighty; therefore nothing defiled gains entrance into her. For she is a reflection of eternal light, a spotless mirror of the working of God, and an image of his goodness. Though she is but one, she can do all things.*

How is it therefore (the Arians and Transylvanians ask) that the Lord in Luke 18:19 asks: *Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.* I respond with Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, with Ambrose in book 2, chapter 1 on Faith, with Jerome and Chiysostom on Matt. 19 that Christ responded according to the mind of the one who had asked him: *Good Teacher, what shall I do, etc.*

For he did not think that Christ is God, but one of the Rabbis.

A majesty worthy of adoration was attributed to Christ in Heb. 1:6: *Let all God's angels worship him.* Here it should be noted that these words are borrowed by Paul from Ps. 97:7 where the poet is speaking about the adoration of latria which is due to God alone; for, he preceded it with: *All worshippers of images are put to shame, who make their boast in worthless idols.* And immediately: *All angels bow down before him,* where idolatry is opposed to the worship of God.

Furthermore, Christ has a temple, which is a real sign of latria: Mal. 3:1: *Then he will come to his holy temple; the messenger of the covenant in whom you delight.* Likewise

the invocation of the absent is the adoration of latria among the adversaries. But Christ is invoked: in John 14:14 he says: *If you ask anything in my name, I will do it.* On this text Augustine said in tractate 73 on John: *Therefore he went to the Father in such a way that he would not desert the needy, but would listen to their prayers.* And Cyril in book 9, chapter 12 on John said: *Here clearly he shows himself to be the true God. For he says he will receive their prayers, and he will give them everything they ask for.* Similarly Stephen in Acts 7:59 said: *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.* And in Acts 9:14 Ananias says to Christ: *Here he has authority from the chief priests to bind all who call upon your name.* And Paul in 2 Cor. 12:8-9: *Three times I besought the Lord about this, that it should leave me; but he said to me, my grace is sufficient for you.* In this place it is clear from what follows that Christ is called "Lord": *I will all the more gladly,* he said, *boast of my weaknesses, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.* In 1 Cor. 1:3 and in almost all of his letters Paul greets the Christians: *Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* There he beseeches for the faithful both grace and peace from God the Father and from God the Son.

But because the adversaries try to escape from these places because of the ambiguity of the Greek text, where the phrase "and from the Lord Jesus Christ" could be read as "and of the Lord Jesus Christ" in the following manner: *Grace to you and peace from God, who is our Father, and who also is the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ;* therefore the place in 2 John 3 should be noted where Paul's thought is clearly expressed: ειρήνη παρά Θεοϋ και παράκυριοϋ 'Ιησοϋ Χρστοϋ, *Peace from God, and from the Lord Jesus Christi.* The more obscure places of Paul should be explained on the basis of this place.

Finally, almost all the prophets foretold that, after the coming of the Messiah, idolatry would be abolished. But the Church in the whole world has always worshipped Christ in temples, on altars, with invocations, with feast days; therefore either Christ is the true God worthy of the cult of latria, or all the prophets were deceived. For, if Christ is not the true God, never was there in the world such an outstanding idol, nor did idolatry flourish more than after the coming of Christ. Nevertheless the Holy Spirit says in Isa. 2:17-18: *The Lord alone will be exalted in that day. And the idols shall utterly pass away.* Zech. 13:1: *On that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem to cleanse them from sin and uncleanness. And on that day, says the Lord of hosts, I will cut off the names of the idols from the land, so that they shall be remembered no more.* See also Isa. 31, Ezek. 6 and 30, Hosea 10 and Mic. 1.

The Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 4, and Francis David and Blandrata in Disputations 4 and 6 respond to these texts on adoration that Christ is to be adored, both because God the Father has commanded it, and because in himself he possesses the adorable divinity. But that is not so. For if Christ is not true God, God the Father could not command such adoration without contradicting himself. For, in Deut. 6:13 he orders to be written: *You shall adore the Lord God, and him only shall you serve;* and there is Isa. 42:8: *My glory I give to no other.* Therefore how could he command that we serve a creature, and confer his glory on a creature? Likewise, if Christ is God, but not the supreme and most high, then the cult of latria should not be given to him, which belongs only to the Most High. But that God should dwell in Christ does not suffice for him to be adored,

otherwise the whole world could be adored, and especially the holy angels and the men in whom God dwells in a special way.

Because of this argument Francis David, although previously he had often taught that Christ is God, and is to be adored, not indeed as the Most High, but as the Son of the Most High, nevertheless later changed his opinion and taught that Christ should not be called God, nor to be adored, nor to be invoked. And he responded to all the texts, which we cited above for the invocation of Christ, as is clear from the book against Faustus. But it is not necessary to waste time refuting him; for, his arguments are pure trifles, or if they have some value, they apply more to Blandrata, who says that Christ is not the true God, but nevertheless should be adored and invoked. But against us they have no value—and these are his main arguments. If Christ should be adored with divine worship, and invoked as God; therefore with the papists it will have to be said that Christ is the one God with the Father, and it will be necessary to bring back the Trinity, which until now we have rejected. Likewise, if Christ is not the true God, and still can be invoked; then also the Holy Spirit, indeed also Mary, and the angels, and the other saints can be invoked. Therefore to what purpose until now have we accused the papists of idolatry, because they invoke the saints?

These arguments are certain proofs against Blandrata, and Faustus, and the other Anti-Trinitarians. But they, since they are clearly shown to be mistaken by Francis David and his followers, obviously are contradicting themselves, so on the contrary they prove against Francis David and his companions that they pervert the testimonies of the Scriptures with incredible temerity.

But it may help, by way of an example, to present the responses of Francis David to the testimony of Acts 7:58: *As they were stoning Stephen, he prayed: Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.* First of all Francis David says that it is an example or a fact about Stephen, but not the testimony of Scripture. But it is an example of a man who, according to Scripture, *was full of faith and the Holy Spirit* (see Acts 6:8). Secondly, he says that the phrase "Lord Jesus" is an invocation to the Father; for he says that the word "Jesus" is in the genitive case, so that the meaning is: *You Father, who are the Lord of your Son Jesus, receive my spirit.*

But we never find elsewhere the phrase "Lord Jesus" in that sense, so that "Jesus" is in the genitive case; but we do find it in Rev. 22:20 in the vocative case: ἔρχου Κύριε Ἰησοῦ, *Come, Lord Jesus.* Moreover, in Acts 7:56 Stephen saw Jesus standing at the right hand of God, when he said: *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit;* therefore he was invoking Jesus himself. To this Francis David responds: those words of Stephen, *Behold, I see the heavens opened,* can have this meaning: *I am so certain that Jesus has resurrected, and is now in heaven, as if now I were to see Jesus himself in the open heavens.* But Luke says: *He gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God.* Therefore he truly saw it, and not only just believed that he saw it. He responds thirdly: the words "Lord Jesus" are directed to the Father, because the Father is also called "Lord Jesus," since it is proper to the Father to rule and to save. But what kind of temerity is this—to attribute the proper name of the Son to the Father? Is this not to confuse the Father with the Son as the Sabellians do?

CHAPTER IX

THE SIXTH CLASS IS FROM THE WORKS

There are five works of God alone—Creation, Conservation, Salvation, Foreknowledge of hidden things, Working of miracles.

The first work of God proper to him is Creation, Isa. 44:24: *Iam the Lord who made all things, who stretched out the heavens alone, who spread out the earth, and no one was with me.* Hence through this work God wishes to be distinguished from the gods that are not true. Ps. 96:5: *All the gods of the Gentiles are idols; but the Lord made the heavens.* Jer. 10:11: *The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens.* Therefore if we prove that Christ made heaven and earth, it will have been proved that he is the one true God with the Father. But we have explained many texts above, for example, John 1:3: *All things were made through him.* And in the same place: *And the world was made through him.* Col. 1:16: *All things were created through him.* Heb. 1:10: *And thou, Lord, didst found the world in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of thy hands.*

To these we add this text from Prov. 8:29-30: *When he established the heavens, Iwas there, when he drew a circle on the face of the deep, when he made firm the skies above, etc., then Iwas beside him like a master workman.* This text cannot be understood to be about essential Wisdom, as we proved above, because it is not generated; but this passage says: *Before the hills, Iwas brought forth* (v. 25); nor is it about created Wisdom, for it did not exist before the world. Nor can it be said that the book is not canonical, as the Transylvanians say, because neither the Jews nor the Christians ever had doubts about this book. Similarly in John 5:19: *Whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise;* but the Father daily creates human souls who are born, and long ago he created heaven and earth. Therefore the Son also now creates souls, and long ago created the whole world.

The Samosatenians and Arians counter this argument in various ways. The new Samosatenians deny that Christ is the creator, because he did not exist before the Virgin Mother; and above we have already refuted their response to the quoted texts. But I now add one more point against them. If Christ did not create the heavens and the earth, either he is not God, or he should be banished from the world. For, in Jer. 10:11 it is said: *The gods who did not make the heavens and the earth shall perish from the earth and from under the heavens.* But the Samosatenians do not deny that Christ exists; therefore they should admit that he is the creator.

The old Arians according to Augustine in book 1 against Maximinus and in his sermon on Arianism, and Valentinus Gentilis, a reviver of Arianism, in his thesis 24, respond to the above that the Father alone is the principal author of the heavens and the earth, but that the Son was a helper of the Father in the creation. The Transylvanians also in book 2, chapter 6, say that Christ is not the eternal God, and that he did nothing in the creation of the world; however, if something should be conceded to him, nothing more can be conceded but that he was an instrument of the Father.

Their main argument, one that the Transylvanians also make use of, is this: because in Scripture it is always said—the Father created through the Son, and the preposition "from" (ex) is attributed to the Father, while the preposition "through" *(per)* is attributed to the Son, as in 1 Cor. 8:6: *There is one God the Father, from whom are all things... and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.* John 1:3: *All things were created through him.* Heb. 1:2: *Through whom also he created the world.* Col. 1:16: *All things were created through him.* The Transylvanians also add in this place that the Council of Syrmiensis, which is accepted by Hilary as orthodox, and is explained in the book on the Synod: for, in canon 3, and in the last canon, that Council said that the Son of God assisted the Father in the creation of the world. Also, they add testimonies of Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 8, and book 4, chapter 13 of Tertullian on the Trinity, of Eusebius in book 1, chapter 1 and 2 of his History, and of Luther, whom they call a messenger of God in the commentary on Genesis 1, where he calls Christ an instrument of God.

Therefore we have to demonstrate that the Son is God not as an instrument, but that he created the world as the principal cause. First of all it is clear from Heb. 1:10: *And thou, Lord, didst found the earth in the beginning, and the heavens are the work of thy hands.* For, that this is not to be understood ministerially I prove from the fact that David says the same thing about the God of Israel, whom the adversaries say is the Father, and it is certain that he was not an instrument of creation. Moreover, in that chapter Paul compares Christ with the angels, and says there is this difference—that the angels are servants. Christ is not a servant; for he says this: *But to what angel has he ever said, sit at my right hand, till I make thy enemies a stool for my feet? Are they not all ministering spirits sent forth to serve?*

Secondly, I prove my thesis from Isa. 48:16, for he who says: *and now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit,* whom we showed above in the first class of arguments to be the Son—he is the same one who says: *For my own sake I do it, and how should my name be profaned? My glory I will not give to another* (48:11). But one who works for his own sake certainly is not an instrument.

Thirdly, from Rev. 1:8, where the Son is called the alpha and the omega, *the beginning and the end, the Almighty.* For, if he is the beginning and the end, as alpha and omega are in the alphabet, certainly he is the first principle and the last end of all things. Therefore he is not an instrument; for neither one of these terms is suitable for an instrument Likewise, if he is omnipotent, he can create the world as the principal author; therefore he must not be the servant for someone else.

Fourthly, I prove my point with a logical demonstration: If the Father creates through the Son, either the Father alone commands, and the Son alone acts, or both act, but the Father as the first cause, and the Son as the second, or both together as the primary cause, but the Father by his will, the Son commanded by the Father; for it is not easy to assign another way in which the Son could concur with the Father in creation, and still not act as an equally principal cause with the Father. But none of those ways agrees with the truth, as will be clear from what we will soon say; therefore the Son is the creator of things as an equally principal cause with the Father.

The Arians said that the Father did nothing by himself, but that the Son did everything

at the command of the Father, because creatures are not capable of immediate divine action; and because it is unworthy that that supreme power should demean itself by doing small things, as Cyril says in book 5, chapter 3 of his theses.

But that is not correct. For, in Prov. 8:27 we read that the Father also acted: *When he made firm the skies above.., I was beside him.* John 5:19: *Whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise.* And concerning small things we read in Matt. 10:29: *Not one sparrow will fall to the ground without your Father's will.* Moreover, nowhere do we read that the Father commanded the Son. Likewise we read that the Son acted by commanding. In Bar. 3:33 it is said of the one who was seen on earth and lived with men: *He who sends forth the light, and it goes, called it, and it obeyed him in fear; the stars shone in their watches, and were glad; he called them, and they said: Here we are! They shone with gladness for him who made them.* And Luke 8:25: *Who then is this, that he commands even the wind and the water, and they obey him?*

The reasoning of the Arians is not valid. For, in order to completely refute them Athanasius in sermon 3 against Arius, and Cyril in book 5, chapter 2 and 3 on his theses say that the Son is either God or a creature. If he is God, then in their opinion he could not create immediately. If he is a creature, then he could not be created immediately by the Father, unless perhaps they want to say that the Son is some middle thing between God and the creature, which of course cannot be the case. For, either it is produced from nothing, or from something created, or from the substance itself of God. If it is the first or second possibility, then he is a creature. If the third, then he is God; therefore there is no middle thing. What we have, therefore, is that both the Father and the Son really worked in the creation of the world: therefore we have refuted that first way, which we proposed in the argument.

Again, it cannot be said that both worked together, but the Father did the major part and the Son did the minor. For that conflicts with Scripture in Prov. 8:29: *Then I was beside him, like a master workman.* And John 5:19: *Whatever the Father does, that the Son does likewise.* Therefore both do the whole work. Again, it cannot be said that both did the whole work, but the Father is the principal agent, and the Son is the instrumental cause. For, the Son either has the power of creating in himself, as the sun has the power of illuminating, although it is an instrument of God, or he does not have it, but is like the shadow of Peter, or the garment of Paul, with respect to the miracles which are performed by it. If the second case is true, then the Son of God has nothing more than other creatures.

Moreover, what does Paul mean when he says in 1 Cor. 1:24: *Christ is the power of God?* And in Heb. 1:3: *He upholds the universe by his word of power?* Therefore he has in himself the power of doing what he does; but the power of creating is infinite power, and it cannot be in an instrument, but only in the supreme and infinite artificer. Therefore all the Fathers include Basilides and some others among the heretics, because they said that the world was created by angels. See Irenaeus book 1, chapter 22, Athanasius in sermon 3 against Arius, Augustine in book 12, chapters 24 and 25 in *The City of God,* Cyril 2 against Julian, and Damascene in book 2, chapter 3. Therefore the Son is a principal creator.

You will say: he has the power of creating, but he is not the principal one, because the

Father operates by his own choice, and the Son by that of another. I deny that: for John 5:21 says: *For as the Father raises the dead and gives them life, so also the Son gives life to whom he will* Likewise the Holy Spirit acts freely and according to his own will, 1 Cor. 12:11 : *He apportions to each one individually as he wills.* But the Holy Spirit is not greater than the Son, indeed according to the adversaries he is lesser; therefore the Son also acts freely, and as he wills. Finally, if the Son has the power of creating, or the exact same power as the Father, or a different power; if it is the same, then there is one creator, and one work, one will, one essence of both. If it is different, then the saying in 1 Sam. 2:2 is false: *There is no rock like our God.* And what is said in Exod. 15:11: *Who is like thee, O Lord, among the gods.* Another one equally strong is not found, except Christ.

To the argument about the prepositions "from" and "through" I respond: the preposition "from" is often attributed to the Father, "through" to the Son, and "in" to the Holy Spirit, not because one person is the instrument of another, but to point out their properties. For, as Basil teaches in chapter 4 of his work on the Holy Spirit, "from" is attributed to the Father to signify that he is the principle without a principle. For "from" is a quality of an efficient cause. "Through" is attributed to the Son, because "through" is a sign of a middle cause, and the Son is a principle from a principle, for he has from the Father that he is a principle. Hence the Son is said to operate from the Father: *When the Spirit comes,* he said, *whom I will send to you from the Father* (John 15:26). Although it could also be said that the word "through" is attributed to the Son, because wisdom is appropriated to the Son, and God created everything through his wisdom, as Damascene teaches in book 1, chapter 9. Finally, "in" signifies what is contained in, and it is attributed to the Holy Spirit, who is the linking together of the Father and the Son. Still, lest this diversity of prepositions cause a problem for the Faith, God has provided for it in two ways.

First, by indicating that all these things are fitting for the same God. For, it is said in Rom. 11:33 : *O the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God, etc... For from him and through him and to him are all things.* For, all these things are said about one and the same God, as is clear from what precedes: *the knowledge of God, his judgments, his inscrutable ways,* and from what follows: *To him be glory for ever.* Either, therefore, they are said about the Father alone, and then it is clear that "through" does not signify service, because it is attributed to the Father, and it is clear that he is not the servant of anyone; or it is attributed to the Son alone, or the Holy Spirit alone, and then the Son and the Holy Spirit are not servants, because "from" is attributed to them, which pertains to a principal author, as they also admit; or they are said about all together, and then all together are one God. This is the advice of Ambrose in book 4, chapter 6 on Faith, Basil in chapter 5 on the Holy Spirit, and Augustine in book 1, chapter 6 on the Trinity.

Second, he provided for it by mixing together these propositions; for sometimes "through" is attributed to the Father, as in 1 Cor. 1:9: *God is faithful, through whom you were called into the fellowship of his Son.* Gal. 4:7: So *through God you are no longer a slave but a son.* Sometimes "from" and "of" are attributed to the Son, as in 1 John 1:16: *And from his fullness we have all received.* Col. 2:19: *From whom the whole body nourished and knit together, etc.* John 16:14: *He will take from what is mine.* Ambrose

and Basil also make note of this in the texts already cited.

To the canon of the Council of Syrmiensis I respond with Basil in the same place: The Son is said to be a servant, not because he is really inferior, or subject, but because he is from the Father. For he served not as a servant for a lord, but as a son for his father, among whom although there is not inequality of nature or of dignity, there is still in the Father the authority of the principle, which is not in the Son with respect to the Father; for the Son is from the Father, and not vice versa. But it is clear that this does not produce real servitude, because otherwise all sons would be servants. You can add to this, that I do not know what kind of authority that Council of Syrmiensis has; for it seems to me that it should be more tolerated than approved. Certainly in distinctions 16 and 20 in Gratian, where the Catholic Councils are enumerated, there is no mention of Syrmiensis.

I make the same response concerning Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eusebius and Luther. Although in dogmatic matters the authority of Tertullian and Eusebius is small, that of Luther is nil; for all are manifest heretics, but Tertullian and Eusebius were very learned men. And Luther is more noted for his loquacity than for his solid doctrine.

Another work proper to God is the conservation of the whole world, which is a certain kind of ongoing creation, which is mentioned in Acts 17:28: *For in him* w *live, and move and have our being;* but this same quality belongs to the Son in Heb. 1:3: *He upholds the universe by his word of power.* And in Col. 1:17: *In him all things hold together,* that is (as Chrysostom rightly explains it), the subsistence of all things depends on the Son of God, so that if they are conserved by him, they subsist; but if not, they immediately disappear; therefore the Son is true God.

The third work is salvation, as in Isa. 43:11: *I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Savior.* And 45:21 : *A righteous God and Savior, there is none besides me.* Hosea 13:4: *I am the Lord your God... and besides me there is no Savior.* But what is more fitting for Christ than to save? Matt. 1:21 : *You shall call his name Jesus, for he will save his people.* For the name Jesus, which means "salvation," is taken from But you should not say that he saves by serving; listen to what Paul says in Heb. 1:3: *He upholds the universe by the word of his power. When he had made purification by himself for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, etc.* For although the phrase "by himself' is lacking among the Latins, nevertheless in the Greek it is δι' αὐτόν, and there Paul compares Christ with the angels as servants, and he calls Christ the Lord. Likewise in Isa. 35:4: *Behold, your God,* that is, by himself and not by an ambassador, *will come and save you.* Likewise the Apostles said that they were servants of Christ, not associates, 1 Cor. 4:1: *This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ.* And in his name they baptized, they reconciled, they worked miracles, etc., and so they showed that they were servants of Christ.

The fourth work is the prediction of future events, and scrutinizing hearts, as in: Isa. 41:23: *Tell us what is to come hereafter, that we may know that you are gods.* Jer. 17:9: *The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately corrupt; who can understand it? I the Lord search the mind and try the heart.* But all of these things pertain to Christ, as in: John 13:19: Z *tell you this now before it takes place, that when it does take place you may believe that I am he.* And in 1 Pet. 1:11: *They inquired what person or time was*

indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory. John 2:25: *He himself knew what was in man.* And Rev. 2:23: *And all the churches shall know that I am he who searches mind and heart.*

You will say that the prophets also predicted future events, and foresaw the thoughts of hearts, as is clear about Elisha. But that was different. For, Paul in Heb. 3 compares Christ with Moses, the greatest of the prophets, and says that Moses is a servant and Christ is the Lord. Similarly, Christ speaks in the same way, like God Almighty—in a way in which no prophet dared to speak. For who ever said: *I search minds and hearts,* except the true and Most High God? Finally, if the Spirit of Christ enlightened all the prophets, as in 1 Pet. 1:2, does not Christ know hidden things in a higher way than the prophets do?

The fifth work is the working of miracles, Ps. 72:18: *Who alone does wondrous things.* And Ps. 86:10: *For you are great and do wondrous things, you alone are God.* And Ps. 136:4: *To him who alone does great wonders.* However, this is understood to be done by his own authority, for in a different respect the holy Apostles and Prophets performed miracles, but through the invocation of God, as Hilary says about this text. But Christ worked miracles by his own power, as is clear, both when he commanded, as in Mark 4:39: *He said to the sea: Peace! Be still!* And in chapter 9:24: *You dumb and deaf spirit, I command you, come out of him.* And because by his will alone, although being absent, he cured the sick, as is clear concerning the servant of the centurion in Matt. 8:13 and the son of the official in John 4:50. And finally, because as the true Lord of all nature, he also grants the power to others of working miracles (Matt. 10:1), and the Apostles worked miracles by invoking him, as is known from these words in Acts. 3:6: *In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk.*

CHAPTER X

THE SEVENTH CLASS IS FROM THE FATHERS.

Catholic truth will be proved from the teaching of the Fathers; for, although the adversaries have little or no regard for the Fathers, still they think that the Fathers who lived before the Council of Nicaea are on their side, like Ignatius, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian. Although they admit that some are opposed to them, nevertheless they cite the testimonies of Hilary, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Cyril, Jerome and Augustine against us, in order to show that the Fathers had different views, and that they contradicted themselves, forced to do so by the evidence of the truth. In short, they try to weaken our argument from the consent of the Fathers of all ages. Therefore we will produce witnesses in all ages who agree with each other, and especially those before the Council of Nicaea.

In the first century, until the year 100 A.D., we have Clement, Ignatius, Dionysius, Martial. Clement is the first one to consider. In book 8, chapter 16 of the Constitutions, he says that the Father without any assistance generated a Son before all things, that is to say, the Son was not made, but he proceeded naturally and necessarily from the Father. For, as Basil teaches in book 4 on Eunomius, nothing became the immediate work of the artificer, because the operation occupies the middle, and between God and creatures the will of creating occupies the middle place. For, given the existence of God, the creature is not given immediately; but given the existence of God, his Word exists immediately. Likewise in chapter 17, after he had recited the words *Holy, Holy, Holy,* he adds the following explanation: *Holy God the Father, Holy God the Son, etc.* And at the end of chapter 18 he says to God: *To you all glory, and honor and adoration, to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, now and always and forever and ever,* Basil in chapter 29 of his book on the Holy Spirit cites from Clement a place similar to this.

Now St. Dionysius the Areopagite, a disciple of St. Paul, in chapter 1 of his book on the Divine Names, said: *Therefore in almost every theological treatise we see that the Most High Divinity is celebrated in a holy manner, indeed as singular and unique because of its simplicity and unbreakable unity; but as the Trinity because of the expression of the super-essential fecundity in the three persons.* And after that he says that this supreme essence assumed human flesh in one of its own hypostases. He has something similar in chapter 3 of work on mystical theology.

St. Martial in letter 1, chapter 10 to Burdegalen said: *You will find no division in the divinity of the Trinity.* And after that: *And these,* Father, Son and Holy Spirit, *are divided into three persons, in divinity it is one God undivided.* For many reasons I suspect that this letter is not really by this Martial, who is said to have been a disciple of Christ; however, no matter who wrote it, it offers no help to the adversaries, but very much for us.

St. Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostle John and a martyr, in his letter to the Philippians says that it is necessary to believe *not in a God with three names, nor in three incarnations, but in three persons with the same honor.* And after that: *But if,* he said, *he is God and man, why do you call the Lord of glory, who has an unchangeable nature, unjust?* And after that he said: *Now, this expression, "If you be the Son, ° is an indication of ignorance.*

For if you had possessed real knowledge, you would have understood that the Creator can with equal ease both create what does not exist, and change that which already has a being. In his letter to the Philadelphians he said: *If someone says there is one God, and confesses Christ Jesus, but thinks he is a mere man; such a one is a serpent, preaching fraud and error for the destruction of men, and is lacking in understanding in accordance with the name "Ebion."* Note that this place is really opposed to the new Ebionites, who say that Christ is a mere man, because in the Hebrew language the word yp (Ebion) means "poor" or "lacking something," and Ignatius elegantly says that the Ebionites are lacking in understanding.

Again the same Ignatius in his letter to the Antiochenens wrote: *Reject every Jewish and Gentile error, and neither introduce a multiplicity of gods, nor yet deny Christ under the pretense of [maintaining] the unity of God. For Moses, the faithful servant of God, when he said: The Lord your God is one Lord, and thus proclaimed that there was only one God, did yet immediately confess also our Lord when he said: The Lord rained upon Sodom and Gomorrah fire and brimstone from the Lord.* And after that he said: *Whosoever, therefore, declares that there is but one God, only so as to take away the divinity of Christ, is a devil, and an enemy of all righteousness.* And in the letter to Polycarp he said: *Look for Him who is above all time, eternal and invisible, yet who became visible for our sakes; impalpable and impassible, yet who became passible on our account.* All of these quotes are expressly against the Transylvanians, who say that Christ is temporal and merely human. They are also against the new Tritheists and Arians, who say that although Christ is eternal, still they deny that he is true God. From this it can also easily be gathered how those places are to be understood, which Valentinus Gentilis and the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 6 cite from Ignatius.

First, they quote the letter to the Magnesians, where it is said: *He announced the one and only true God as his Father;* therefore, said the heretic, only the Father is true God. I respond that the "only" separates the Father of Christ from those who are not of the same substance with him. For, the meaning is that the Father of Christ is that God who is the one and only true God, and the same thing can be said about the Son and the Holy Spirit. For, since there is only one true divinity: the Father is that God who is the one and only God, and the Son is that God who is the one and only God, and the Holy Spirit is that God who is the one and only God. Finally, Ignatius said nothing other than what Christ himself had said before to his Father: *That they may know you the only true God* (John 17:3).

Second, they quote the letter to the Tarsians, where Ignatius says that Christ is the Son of the creator, and that he is not the one who is God over all, but his Son. I respond that Christ is the Son of the creator in such a way that he is also that same creator, as the same Ignatius says in his letter to the Philippians. The reason for this is because the Father, by generating, communicates his whole essence to the Son, and therefore also his whole power and wisdom, whereby the world was created. Then, only the Father is said by Ignatius to be God over all things, because of his authority as being the principle, not because of a diversity of nature. Otherwise he would be in conflict with Paul in Rom. 9:5 and also with himself, since he had said in his letter to the Philippians that the Father and

the Son enjoy the same honor.

Third, they quote the letter to the Philippians where he explains that these words in Deut. 6:4 apply to the Father: *The Lord our God is one Lord.* And after that he introduces Christ speaking to Satan: *I am acquainted with the only [Lord] from whom you have become an apostate. I am not an enemy of God; I acknowledge His pre-eminence.* I respond that Ignatius in quoting Deut. 6:4 wants to prove that there is one Father, and not several Fathers, as he also teaches below that there is one Son and not several. He proves it very well in this way: *The Lord our God is one Lord, etc.* (Deut. 6:4), therefore there is only one God the Father; for, if there were several Fathers, they could not be one Lord God. For now the Father and the Son are one God, because one is from the other. Then the Son confesses the excellence of the Father by reason of being the principle only; hence he adds immediately: *I know the Father as the author of my generation.* However this place could be understood as being about Christ the man; for, Christ the man speaks to the devil, and then everything is clearly logical; for Christ as man is truly less than the Father, and he can call the Father his Lord and God, as he himself says in John 20:17: *I om ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.*

Fourth, they quote the last words in the letter to the Antiochenens, *Fare well in God, and in Christ.* I respond that here Christ is distinguished from God by reason of his humanity; for, in other respects in this letter Ignatius calls the devil the one who, under the pretext of one God, denies the divinity of Christ.

Finally, this is quoted from the letter to the Ephesians: *But our physician is the only true God, unbegotten and invisible, etc.* I respond that this place is read in various ways; for, some of the older manuscripts have this: *But our one physician is the only true unbegotten God, and invisible to all, the unbegotten Father and Generator.* There is another reading in Theodoretus in Dialogue 1, where it is cited thus: *Our physician is begotten from the unbegotten, etc.* Athanasius in the book on the Synods held in Ariminum and Selene cites this sentence in the following way: *Our one physician is corporal and spiritual, begotten and unbegotten, God in man, etc.,* and he explains that he is unbegotten, that is, uncreated. However, even the first reading is not opposed to our position. For, after Ignatius had said: *But our physician is the only true unbegotten God,* he then adds: *But we also have the physician Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Word before the world.* From this we understand that exclusive "only," since Ignatius said: *the physician is the only true unbegotten God,* not excluding the Son of God, but created things, which are not of the same essence with the true unbegotten God.

In the second century until the year 200 we have four other Fathers—Justin, Athenagoras, Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria. Justin at the beginning of the book on the right faith said: *There is really one God of this universe, who is acknowledged in the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; for since the Father generated the Son out of his own substance, and out of the same produced the Holy Spirit; therefore they have one and the same essence, and they are honored with one and the same divinity.* And after that he proves that the Son and the Spirit are not creatures, but the one God and creator with the Father. In his Apology to the Senate he said: *And His Son, who alone is properly called Son, the Word who also was with Him and was begotten before the works, when at first*

He created and arranged all things by Him, is called Christ, in reference to His being anointed and God's ordering all things through Him. In the Apology for Antoninus, at the beginning he said: *And we confess that we are atheists, so far as gods of this sort are concerned, but not with respect to the most true God, the Father of righteousness and temperance and the other virtues, who is free from all impurity. But both Him, and the Son (who came forth from Him and taught us these things, and the host of the other good angels who follow and are made like to Him), and the prophetic Spirit, we worship and adore, knowing them in reason and truth.* Here he opposes the worship of the Trinity to the worship of idols and of false gods, and then he teaches that the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are the true God. In the same place, beyond the middle, he wants those words of Exod. 3:14, *I am who I am,* to have been said by Christ: *Because,* he said, *it was said to Moses in a flame of fire out of the bush, I am who I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the God of your fathers; this means that those dead men still live, that they are men living in Christ.*

He repeats the same thing at length in the Dialogue with Trypho; there near the end he teaches that the Father and the Son are two, but nevertheless of one essence. *That power,* he said, *can in no way be removed and separated from the Father.* And after that: *And that this power which the prophetic word calls God, as has been also amply demonstrated, and Angel, is not numbered [as different] in name only like the light of the sun but is indeed something numerically distinct, I have discussed briefly in what has gone before; when I asserted that this power was begotten from the Father, by His power and will, but not by abscission, as if the essence of the Father were divided; as all other things partitioned and divided are not the same after as before they were divided.*

By these words from Justin the objection of Gentilis is answered. For, he objects that in the dialogue with Trypho Justin says that Christ is another God, beside the creator of the world; but Justin does not say this, but only teaches that there is another one, that is, another person, who exists, and is called God and Lord in addition to the Father, and to whom the creation of the world is attributed. Here are his words: έστιν και λέγεται Θεός και κύριος έτερος ύπερ τόν ποιητόν των όλων, where that έτερος is not joined together with *God,* but with the verb έστιν and so the meaning is: *there is another beside the creator of the world, and he is called God.* Likewise, ούτος ό τω Αβραάμ και τω Ιακόβ και τω Μωσεϊ ώφσθαι, λελεγομένος και γεγραμένος Θεός έτερος έστιν του τα πάντα ποιήσαντος Θεού, that is, *the one who appeared to Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and who is said to be and written down as God, is someone other than the one who made all things.* And then immediately explaining how he is other, he adds: άριτμώ λέγω ον γνώμη, *in number,* he said, *not in idea,* that is, different in person, not in essence.

You will say: If Christ is distinguished from the creator of the world, therefore he is not the creator of the world. I respond: to describe the creator of the world, usually the power for this and creation are attributed to the Father; for in other respects also the Son is the creator of the world. Justin clearly teaches this same thing in his Second Apology. *The Son of God is the Word of the Father, in idea and in operation; for after the pattern of Him and by Him were all things made, the Father and the Son being one. And, the Son being in the Father and the Father in the Son.* And after that: *The Son is the first product*

of the Father, not as having been brought into existence, for from the beginning, God, who is the eternal mind [νους], had the Word in Himself. And further on: *Who, then, would not be astonished to hear men who speak of God the Father, and of God the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, and who declare both their power in union and their distinction in order.* And again much further: *We say that both the Son, who is the Father's Word, and the Holy Spirit are God; they are indeed three according to power—Father, Son and Holy Spirit, but in their operation and essence they are one.*

St. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 6 said: *Therefore neither would the Lord, nor the Holy Spirit, nor the Apostles, have ever named as God, definitely and absolutely, him who was not God, unless he were truly God; nor would they have named any one in his own person Lord, except God the Father ruling over all, and His Son.* And after that: *Since, therefore, the Father is truly Lord, and the Son truly Lord, the Holy Spirit has fitly de signated them by the title of Lord.* In book 3, chapter 8: *He indeed who made all things can alone, together with His Word, properly be termed God and Lord: but the things which have been made cannot have this term applied to them, neither should they justly assume that appellation which belongs to the Creator.* In book 3, chapter 12: the Apostles announced *that this is the Christ, the eternal Son of God, their King.* And in book 3, chapter 16 he said: *Since it has been clearly stated that they called no one else God, or named him Lord, who were preachers of the truth and Apostles of freedom, except the only true God the Father and his Word, who has the primacy in all things; it will be clearly shown that the Maker of the heavens and the earth, and the one who spoke with Moses, and gave him the disposition of the Law, and assembled the Fathers, they called the Lord God, and they know no one else, etc.* And in chapter 20: *All contradiction of those speaking,* he said, *is excluded; therefore if he was born then, he was not before Christ. For we have shown that the Son of God did not then begin to be, since he always existed with the Father.* And in book 4, chapter 11: *Therefore Christ himself,* he said, *is God with the Father of the living; he it is who spoke to Moses and who manifested himself to the Fathers.*

But Gentilis and the Transylvanians raise many objections from Irenaeus. First, there is this quote from book 1, chapter 2: *The Church received the Faith, which is in one God the Father Almighty, who made the heavens and the earth, the sea and everything in it; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, incarnated for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, etc.* There the one almighty God and creator is called the Father, and the Son of this one creator God is called Jesus Christ. From this it seems to follow that Christ is not the one creator God with the Father.

I respond that this word "one" pertains partly to God, not to the Father; for the meaning is not that the one Father, that is, that Father alone is God the creator, but that the Father is the God, who is the one and only creator of the heavens and the earth. But that it is not said also of the Son that he is the one God creator, that is so, because Irenaeus there is reciting the Creed of Faith, and the Creed has to be very short, and so those things are not to be repeated which can be gathered from what has already been said. But it could be understood that the Son is also that one God creator, both, as Cyril teaches in his explanation of the Nicene Creed, because the Son is understood to be in the Father, and also, because it had been said that there is only one God. And still Faith

in God is said to be Faith in the Father, and in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. Hence the same Irenaeus, in the texts cited by us, says that Christ is God, and the Lord creator, and eternal; nevertheless he constantly repeats that there is only one God.

Secondly, they cite many texts from book 2, chapter 3, and from book 3, chapters^ 9, 11, 12, 16, 18, and from book 4, chapters 1, 2, 37, and from book 5, where Irenaeus often repeats that the God of Israel, the creator of the heavens and the earth, is the Father of Christ, and that Christ would be a misleader, if he should preach another God beside his own Father, etc. For, from this they conclude that Christ is not one God with the Father, since the Father and the Son are distinguished, and are two, not one; and the former one is said to be the God of Israel, the creator.

I respond that Irenaeus repeats those things so often because of the heresiarchs Valentinus and Marcion, who introduced another creator and God of Israel in addition to the Father of Christ. Moreover, because the Father of Christ is called the creator and God of Israel, not only does it not follow that the Son is not creator himself and God of Israel, but rather it follows that he is. For, just as a man generates a man, and a king a king, so also the creator a creator, and God a God, however with this difference—that the divine nature is indivisible. God generates the exact same God, but distinct in person; but a man generates another man only in the same species.

Thirdly, they object that Irenaeus explains the words in Deut. 6:4 about the Father alone, not about the Trinity: *Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God is one Lord.* For this is what he says in book 4, chapter 2: *Christ, too, confesses as His Father, 'whom also the law announces, saying: Hear, O Israel; The Lord your God is one God.*

I respond that Irenaeus does not say that this text must be understood about the Father alone, nor should we understand him to be speaking of the Trinity in such a way that it is not understood also concerning each of the persons separately. For the Trinity is not, as the adversaries imagine, something distinct from the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; but what is said about each person separately, is also said about all of them together, and vice versa, only with the exception of the personal properties. Clement of Alexandria in book 1, chapter 6, said: *But for Him to make any addition to His knowledge is absurd, since He is God. For none can be superior to the Word, or the teacher of the only Teacher. Will they not then own, though reluctantly, that the perfect Word born of the perfect Father was begotten in perfection?* And in book 3 at the end of the last chapter he says this: *Let us praise the one Father and the one Son, with the Holy Spirit, all in One, in whom is all, for whom all is One, for whom is eternity, whose members we all are, whose glory the eons are; for the All-good, All-lovely, All-wise, All-just One. To whom be glory both now and for ever. Amen.* Finally, Ruffinus says in his Apology for Origen that this Clement, in all of his writings, celebrates the one glory and majesty of the three persons.

In the third century we have six others, and the first one is Origen. Origen, a disciple of Clement, has some obvious blasphemies against the Son of God and the Holy Spirit, as is clear from Epiphanius in his letter to John of Jerusalem, and from Jerome in his letter to Avitus on the errors of Origen, but it is very possible that they were inserted into his writings later by the Arians, as Ruffinus teaches in his Apology for Origen. For, in his writings totally Catholic teachings are also found; and Athanasius in his letter on the

decrees of the Council of Nicaea cites Origen against the Arians, and he adds that the Arians could cite no one from the Ancients in favor of their error.

Moreover, Clement the teacher of Origen, and Gregory Thaumaturgus, a disciple of Origen, think correctly about the Trinity; therefore, how probable is it that he would express such false ideas? Therefore, Origen in book 7, chapter 9 in his commentary on Romans, says this: *I cannot understand how some persons, when reading what the Apostle says: There is one God the Father, from whom are all things, and one Lord Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, deny that the Son of God should be professed as God, lest they seem to say there are two Gods. And what they make of this text of the Apostle, in which Christ is proclaimed openly to be God over all things? But those who think in this way do not seem to notice that he said that the Lord Jesus Christ is not the one God in such a way that because of this God the Father is not called the Lord. But both of them are the one God.* Likewise: *But he who is above all things does not have anyone above himself; for he is not after the Father, but from the Father.* Similarly further *w. Evidently the nature of the Trinity is shown, and the one substance, which is above all things.* These are the words of Origen, which are certainly very clear.

St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, the bishop of Neo-Caesarea, in the confession of faith, which is found in Eusebius in book 7, chapter 25 in the version of Ruffinus, and in Gregory of Nyssa in his Oration on Gregory and in his book on the early Councils, says that the Word of God is the true Son of the true Father, God from God, invisible from the invisible, eternal from the eternal. And then he adds: *The perfect Trinity in no way is divided in majesty, eternity and governing.* And he also says: *Nothing subservient, nor made, nor added is found in the Trinity.*

St. Dionysius of Rome published some excellent volumes, concerning which Athanasius in his letter on the views of Dionysius of Alexandria said the following: *In addition, from the volumes of the Roman Bishop Dionysius written against those who say that the Son of God is a creature or a created thing, it is shown clearly that the heresy about Christ of the Arian enemies was condemned not just now for the first time, but long go by everyone.* Likewise, in his letter on the decrees of the Council of Nicaea the same Athanasius quotes these words of the Roman Bishop Dionysius: *I am told that some among you who are catechists and teachers of the Divine Word, take the lead in this tenet, who are diametrically opposed, so to speak, to Sabellius i opinions; for he blasphemously says that the Son is the Father, and the Father the Son, but they in some sort preach three Gods, as dividing the sacred Unity into three substances foreign to each other and utterly separate. For it must needs be that the Word of God is one with the God of all things, and that the Holy Spirit reposes and dwells in God, and that the Holy Trinity is gathered up and brought together in one omnipotent God of all things, as the summit and source. For it is the doctrine of the presumptuous Marcion to sever and divide the Divine Monarchy into three origins—a devil's teaching, not that of Christ's true disciples and lovers of the Savior's lessons. For they know well that a Triad is preached by divine Scripture, but that neither the Old Testament nor the New preaches three Gods. Equally must one censure those who hold the Son to be a work, and consider that the Lord has come into being, as one of the things that really came to be; whereas*

the divine oracles witness to a generation suitable to Him and becoming, but not to any fashioning or making. And after that: *Neither then may we divide into three Godheads the wonderful and divine Unity; nor disparage with the name of "work" the dignity and exceeding majesty of the Lord.* Also further on; *For thus both the Divine Trinity, and the holy preaching of the Monarchy, will be preserved.* These are the words of a man who, 1300 years ago, condemned not only the Arians who had not yet been born, but also the Tritheists and Samosatenians of our own time.

St. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, since he had been accused before the Roman Bishop Dionysius of saying that the Son of God was a creature, wrote an apology; Basil cites some things from it in chapter 29 of his book on the Holy Spirit, but Athanasius quotes it at length in his letter on the thinking of Dionysius of Alexandria. Among other things he says this: *Now because he is the splendor of the eternal light, in every way he is also eternal.* And after that: *In this way we extend the Unity, which is indivisible, to the Trinity, and the Trinity, which cannot be diminished, to the Unity. Then since they accused him of saying that the Son is one of the number of created things, and in no way consubstantial with his Father,* further on he said: *I will show that the crime is false according to which they claim that I denied that Christ is consubstantial with God the Father.* Those are his words.

Tertullian in book 4 *Against Marcion* said: *He says that everything has been given to him by the Father. You believe this, since Christ is from the creator, to whom all things belong, because the creator did not hand over all things, which he created through him, to a Son inferior to himself.* In chapter 3 of his book *Against Praxeas* he said: *Their very rule of faith withdraws them from the world's plurality of gods to the one only true God; not understanding that, although He is the one only God, He must yet be believed in with His own* οικονομία. *The numerical order and distribution of the Trinity they assume to be a division of the Unity; whereas the Unity which derives the Trinity out of its own self is so far from being destroyed, that it is actually supported by it, etc.*

Note that the order and disposition of the three persons is called by Tertullian the economy of God. After that in chapter 9 he said: *Now, observe, my assertion is that the Father is one, and the Son one, and the Spirit one, and that they are distinct from Each Other. This statement is taken in a wrong sense by every uneducated as well as every perversely disposed person, as if it predicated a diversity, in such a sense as to imply a separation among the Father, and the Son, and the Spirit. I am, moreover, obliged to say this, when (extolling the Monarchy at the expense of the Economy) they contend for the identity of the Father and Son and Spirit, that it is not by way of diversity that the Son differs from the Father, but by distribution: it is not by division that He is different, but by distinction; because the Father is not the same as the Son, since they differ one from the other in the mode of their being.* And after that in chapter 12: *In what sense, however, you ought to understand Him to be another, I have already explained, on the ground of Personality, not of Substance—in the way of distinction, not of division. But I must everywhere hold one only substance in three coherent and inseparable (Persons).* And after that in chapter 13: *Now, if there were found in the Scriptures but one Personality of Him who is God and Lord, Christ would justly enough be inadmissible to the title of*

jodandLord:for (in the Scriptures) there was declared to be none other than One God. \nd a little farther on: *I will therefore not speak ofgods at all, nor oflords, but I shall follow the Apostle; so that ifthe Father and the Son are alike to be invoked, I shall call ihe Father God, and invoke Jesus Christ as Lord. But when Christ alone (is mentioned), Ishall be able to call Him God, as the same Apostle says: Ofwhom is Christ, who is over all, God blessedfor ever.* And below that in chapter 17 he said: *And asfor the Fathers' names, GodAlmighty, the Most High, the Lord ofhosts, the King ofIsrael, the One that is, we say (for so much do the Scriptures teach us) that they belonged suitably to the Son also, and that the Son came under these designations, and has always acted in them, and has thus manifested them in Himself to men. All things, says He, which the Father has are mine. Then why not His names also?* And after that in chapter 23: *These three are one, not one as was said: The Father and I are one,for the unity ofsubstance, butfor the singularity ofnumber.*

From these quotes the places raised as objections by Gentilis and the Transylvanians can be explained. First ofall, they raise an objection from the *book Against Hermogenes,* near the beginning: *For He could not have been the Father previous to the Son, nor a Judge previous to sin. There was, however, a time when neither sin existed with Him, nor the Son; theformer ofwhich was to constitute the Lord a Judge, and the latter a Father.*

I respond that these words sound bad and should not be used; however, in Tertullian they do not signify that the Son ofGod as God did not always exist; for, in chapter 8 of his book *Against Praxeas,* he says this: *The Word, therefore, is both always in the Father, as He says, Iam in the Father; and is always with God, according to what is written, And the Word was with God; and never separate from the Father, or other than the Father, since I and the Father are one.* And in chapter 5 he had said: *Moreover, He was alone, because there was nothing external to Him but Himself. Yet not even then was He alone; for He had with Him that which He possessed in Himself, that is to say; His own Reason.* Therefore the Son, about whom Tertullian speaks in the book against Hermogenes, who did not always exist, is not the Word ofGod, but a Son by adoption, that is, any other holy man or angel; for here he is not speaking about Christ, but about a creature of a rational nature, which was added extrinsically, and called God his Father in a temporal sense. Or ifthat Son is the Word ofGod, through the time which did not exist, it is not understood as real time, but a certain priority of origin. For, there Tertullian only wants to say that God could not be called Father until after he had a Son; but the first explanation is more certain and it is also easier to understand.

In the second place, they raise an objection from the book *Against Praxeas: While I acknowledge the Son, I defend him as secondfrom the Father.* I respond: he calls the Son second, and the Spirit third, because ofthe order oforigin, not because ofdifferent grades in the essence. For, in the book against Hermogenes, long before the middle, he says: *Divinity does not have grades, because it is unique.* And in the book against Praxeas he repeats often that there is one substance ofthe Father and the Son. Hence, in the same book near the beginning when he said that the Son is distinguished from the Father, not by state but by grade, and when he says "by grade" he is understanding the order ofthe persons.

In the third place, they raise this objection from the same place: *The Father is the whole substance, but the Son is a derivation and portion of the whole.* I respond: since Tertullian said that the divinity does not have grades, and it is evident that it is absolute! indivisible, necessarily these words should be understood to be about only the personal distinction, which he stresses in the whole book. However, he calls the Son a portion, and the Father the whole substance, because the Father is the fount and principle of the other persons, and in that sense he has a certain priority; and in this way he explains himself in chapter 9: *The Son is a derivation and portion of the whole, as He Himself acknowledges; My Father is greater than I. In the Psalm His inferiority is described as being a little lower than the angels. Thus the Father is distinct from the Son, being greater than the Son, inasmuch as He who begets is one, and He who is begotten is another; He, too, who sends is one, and He who is sent is another, etc.*; however before that, when he was speaking about the substance, he had said that the Son is not other than the Father.

In the fourth place, they raise an objection from chapter 15 of the same book: *The consequence will be,* he said, *that we understand the invisible Father because of the abundance of his majesty, but we acknowledge the visible Son because of the manner of his derivation.* Hence he teaches there that in all the apparitions of God in the Old Testament it was always the Son who was seen, but the Father remained invisible.

I respond that in Tertullian the Father is said to be invisible, and the Son visible, not because the nature of the Son is visible, and that of the Father is invisible, but because the Father, as Tertullian and many others think, never appeared in a corporeal form, but the Son did many times, both in the Old Testament by assuming at times a visible form, and in the New by assuming flesh. But when he says the Son is visible because of the manner of his derivation, he is not speaking about the derivation of the Son from the Father by eternal generation, but about his derivation among us by the assumption of a visible form; that is clearly the case. First, because shortly thereafter Tertullian says this: *We say also that the Son by his name is invisible in the same way as the Word and the Spirit of God are right now from the condition of the substance, and because it is God, and the Word and the Spirit. But we say that he was visible before the flesh because of the way in which he speaks to Aaron and Miriam. And if there was a prophet among you, in a vision I will be known by him.* Second, because shortly after that he says it was said about the Father what is read in 1 Tim. 1:17: *To the King of ages, immortal, invisible, the only God.* However, he says that the contrary can be said about the Son, since it is certain that he is mortal and seen, where he clearly speaks about the Son according to his human form.

But here it should be observed that Tertullian from wherever grabs the occasion to prove that the Father is not the Son, against the heresy of Praxeas. And although the Scriptures say that God was seen by Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Isaiah: and Christ as God was seen by the Apostles; Tertullian draws from that the argument that there are two persons in God—one unseen and other seen. And in order to make his argument more convincing, he explains all the texts where God is said to have appeared as being about the Son, and he explains all the texts where God is said to be invisible about the Father. And although this argument of his is not very solid, because the same divine person can be said to be visible and invisible—visible in a human form and invisible in his essence

and personality, nevertheless from this argument of his we gather that his intention was not to deny the divinity of Christ, but to assert his proper personality.

In the fifth place, they raise an objection from the book on the Trinity that the one God of the Jews is the Father of Jesus, and that nothing can be compared with God the Father, and that the Son cannot take away from the Father that he is the one God.

I respond first: that book is not by Tertullian, as is evident, both because in this book the Sabellians are explicitly refuted, and they did not yet exist during the time of Tertullian, and also because St. Jerome in book 2 against Ruffinus attributes this book to Novatian. Secondly, I say that those places are not against us; for, truly the one God of the Jews is the Father of Christ, and Christ did not take away from the Father that he is the one God, because Christ is not a second God, but the same God with the Father. However, nothing can be compared to the Father, if you look at his origin, since he is the principle of the other persons, not vice versa; but with him there is an equality in substance of the three persons.

St. Cyprian in his treatise on *The Vanity of Idols,* near the end, says: *Therefore the one Lord of all is God. For that sublimity cannot possibly have any peer, since it alone possesses all power* And after that he says: *This is our God, this is Christ.* And in book 2, chapter 6 for Quirinius he says that Christ is God. He proves it from the texts of Scripture, which all agree are speaking about the one true God of Israel: for example, from Gen. 35:1 : *Make there an altar to the God who appeared to you when you fled from your brother Esau.* Likewise from Isa. 45:14-15: *God is with you only, and there is no other, no God besides him. Truly, thou art a God who hides himself, O God of Israel, the Savior.* Likewise from Rom. 9:5: *Of their race is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed forever.* From these quotes it is obvious that for Cyprian Christ is the true God of Israel.

From Cyprian the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter *6* claim for themselves one text in his explanation of the Creed, where the creator God is said to be the Father of Christ, and that there is one God the Father, one Lord Jesus Christ, one Holy Spirit.

I respond first that the explanation of the Creed is not by Cyprian, but by Ruffinus; for there by name Arius, Eunomius and Photinus are refuted, and during the time of Cyprian they had not yet been born. From this you can gather the level of the historical erudition of the Transylvanians, who had not yet learned when their predecessors and parents lived. Secondly, I say: a little bit after the words which the Transylvanians cite, there is an express refutation of them. For the author says this: *What Paul of Samosata says is a council of vanity, and after him what his successor Photinus taught. He said that Christ was not born before the world, but he thinks he was made God from man. What Artus and Eunomius taught is a council of vanity; they say that the Son was not born from the substance of the Father but was created from nothing. They also say that the Son of God had a beginning, and that he is inferior to the Father, etc.* But certainly with greater reason it can be said that the synagogue of the Transylvanians is a council of vanity, since they not only teach the same thing which Paul of Samosata taught formerly, but they also claim for themselves the books in which they are clearly refuted. Thirdly, I say that Christ is the Son of the creator, and therefore that he also is the creator, and the same with the Father, because in his generation he received the whole substance of the Father. And it is

not opposed to our thesis, that the Father is called the one God; for, the Son also is called the one Lord, and nevertheless it is certain that the Father also is the Lord.

In the fourth century we have first of all the general Council of Nicaea with 318 Fathers, which published the Creed and which was recorded by Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 6 of his History, and was repeated in the Creed of Constantinople, and explained by Athanasius and Cyril. Almost all the Fathers mention it with honor. In that Creed the following things are said about the Son. First, that he is true God. Second, that he is ὁμουσιος with the Father, that is, of the same essence with him. Third, that he is eternal. Fourth, that he is immutable and unchangeable like the Father. Fifth, that he was generated, not made. Therefore, the Fathers could not have more clearly refuted those who say that the Son is a creature.

Concerning this Creed, the Transylvanians have published an amazing judgment For, in book 1, chapter 1 they say it is the creed of the Antichrist, and that the words "begotten, not made" are the fantasies of the Antichrist, since they are so clearly opposed to Paul, who says: *He was descended from David according to the flesh* (Rom. 1:3), and *Born of a woman* (Gal. 4:4). In book 2, chapter 6 they say that in this creed their own position is contained, since the Father alone is said to be the one God and creator. For it begins like this: *We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and in our one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God.*

But in both cases they are truly out of their mind. For, since the Creed says that the Son was begotten, not made, it is speaking about Christ as he is God. For, shortly after that it says: *And he was incarnate, and was made man.* Therefore, the same creed asserts that the Son was made and not made: made because he is a man, but not made because he is God. In the same way also St. Paul says that he was made from a woman and from the seed of David; this pertains to his human nature, which he assumed in time. And io another place he says that he was not made from created matter, but begotten from the Father before every creature.

Further, the Father is thus said to be the one God, as we have already said often, as the Son is the one Lord. Therefore, just as the Father is not excluded from the name of Lord, so also neither is the Son excluded from the name of God, but on both sides one holds himself on the part of the predicate, not the subject, that is, the meaning is not that the one Father is God, but that the Father is that God, who is the one God.

Besides the Council of Nicaea, in the same century we have the Council of Constantinople I with 150 Fathers, which again proclaimed that the Son is homousion with the Father. Furthermore, during this time we have many Greek and Latin Fathers. For, Athanasius wrote five long orations against the Arians, and he directed all his other works against them. Basil wrote five books against Eunomius. Gregory Nazianzen composed five treatises on theology. Gregory of Nyssa also wrote five books, that is, one book on the Trinity and four more on almost the same subject. Cyril of Jerusalem wrote five catecheses on this matter, that is, books seven to eleven. Epiphanius wrote accurately, both against Paul of Samosata in heresies 65, and against the Arians in heresies 69.

Of the Latin authors, Hilary wrote twelve books on the Trinity. Lucifer Calaritanus wrote a book to Constantius for Athanasius, and another one concerning dying for the Son

of God. Marius Victorinus wrote four books against Arius. Gregory Beticus composed a book on the Faith against the Arians. Saebalius wrote against the Arians. Ambrose published five books on the Faith. Philastrius in his book on the heresies briefly refuted Samosata and Arius.

Of the Fathers of this fourth century the adversaries raise objections only against Hilary and Ambrose. For, Hilary in book 9 on the Trinity says that the Father alone is the one true God, although Christ is also God. Ambrose in his commentary on 1 Tim. 1:17 explains these words as applying only to the Father: *To the King of ages, immortal, invisible, the only God.* And in the same place concerning the Father alone he says this was said by the Lord Jesus: *No one is good except the Father alone.* And in chapter 6 he says that this is about the Father alone: *Who alone is the powerful King of kings and Lord of lords.*

I respond that Hilary is saying that the Father alone is the true God, but in such a way that it is also not denied that the Son is true God, because the Son is understood to be in the Father, and he has the same essence as the Father. The words which the Transylvanians cite in book 2, chapter 6 from Hilary's book 9 teach this: *The faith of the Church, while confessing the only true God the Father, confesses Christ also. It does not confess Christ true God without the Father the only true God; nor the Father the only true God without Christ. It confesses Christ true God, because it confesses the Father the only true God. Thus the fact that God the Father is the only true God constitutes Christ also true God.* There Hilary clearly confesses that Christ is true God, and one with the Father, as he is one, and true Lord with the same Father.

Regarding the text of Ambrose, first of all I object to those Commentaries, which were not certainly written by Ambrose, in book 2, chapters 1 and 3 on Faith, and in book 3, chapter 2, where he contends that these names: *King of kings, immortal, invisible, good, powerful,* apply also to the Son, and not to the Father alone. Secondly, I say that in these Commentaries their author attributes these epithets to the Father only, not because he alone has them, but because he alone has them from himself. For, in chapter 6 he explains it thus: *The Father has all of these things, similarly also the Son has them from the Father.* He attributes invisibility alone simply to the Father, because only the Father does not appear in a visible form: but the Son appeared, as was said in the quotes from Tertullian; for, this author followed Tertullian.

And because the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 6 dare to say that Ambrose eveiywhere defends the eminence of the eternal Father, let us cite one or two texts of his in book 5 on the Faith in the last chapter where he says: *To You now, Almighty Father, do I direct my words with tears. I indeed have readily called You unapproachable, incomprehensible, inestimable; but I dared not say Your Son was inferior to Yourself.* And after that: *If I have said that You are greater than Your Son, as Arius maintains, I have judged wickedly.* Likewise in his comments on Phil. 2 he said: *Rightly did he make himself equal to God. So Christ, knowing that he is in the form of God, shows himself to be equal to God.* Therefore with great impudence they say that the eminence of the Father was preached everywhere by Ambrose, since he himself with clear words ventures to proclaim that the Father is not greater nor the Son lesser, but on the contrary, he asserts

everywhere their equality. But this is not the first, nor will it be the last lie of the heretics.

In the fifth century from the year 400 to 500 there were two general Councils, who again approved the Nicene Creed, namely the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon. Moreover, there are many Fathers who wrote explicitly in favor of the true divinity; indeed, of the Greeks Chrysostom left many eloquent and learned writings in the form of Orations proving that Christ is God. And in the former, on the saying of the Apostle: *Then the Son himself will be subjected to him, etc.* (1 Cor. 15:28); and also in his Commentaries on John 1, and Col. 1, and Phil. 2 and elsewhere. Moreover, in his Commentaries on John he never omits an occasion to refute the Arians. Theodoret in book 4 on the myths of the heretics, and in book 2 for the Greeks and in his work on the letter of St. Paul passim argues against those who deny that Christ is the true God.

Of the Latin authors, Gaudentius in treatise 7 on Exodus and in his letter to Paul on the statement in the Gospel "the Father is greater than I," refutes the Arians elegantly. Jerome often rebukes the Arians, and often refutes them convincingly, and especially in his book *Against the Luciferians* and in his letter to Marcella on the errors of Montanus; he does the same in another letter to Avitus on the errors of Origen, and in his two letters to Damasus on the use of the word "hypostasis." Augustine wrote five books on the Trinity, three against Maximinus the Arian; also a book against a sermon of the Arians; some letters, like #174 and following, in which he convincingly refutes the Arians. Finally, in his Commentary on the Gospel of John passim he argues against the Arians. Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed, briefly indeed but clearly, rebukes Paul of Samosata and Arius. Idacius Clarus wrote a book to Varimadus against the Arians. Cassian in seven books on the Incarnation includes many things against the same heresy; Prosper does the same in book 3, chapters 2, 3 and 4, on the promises and predictions of God. The Pontiff St. Leo in his famous letter to Flavian, and passim in his letters and sermons, but especially in sermon 1 on Pentecost demolishes the heresy of the Arians. Finally, the Bishop Cerealis in his book against Maximinus the Arian does the same.

From these Fathers the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 6 object first of all regarding Chrysostom, who in his homily 4 on 1 Tim.1 says that the epithets, *To the King of ages, immortal, invisible, etc.* refers essentially to the Father, but to the Son from the Father. From this they conclude that Son was made God by a gift of grace, and immortal King, etc. But Chrysostom is opposed to that, for he says this: *The Father himself has this by nature, but we by grace. Does the Son have it the same way? By no means. He also has this by his nature.* And after that he said: *And when I hear that the Father is the King of ages, I do not take the dominion away from the Son. For they are common to both the Father and the Son.*

Secondly, they object to Cyril who, in book 10, chapter 4 of his Thesaurus applies to the Father and not to the Trinity these words in Isa. 44:6: *I am the first and I am the last.* I respond: in that place Cyril says that those words pertain to the Father, but he does not deny that they apply also to the Son. Indeed, in chapter 6 he speaks in this way, explaining the passage: *These words are said by the Father not for the degradation of the Son, lest perhaps, as is reported among the myths of the Gentiles, you should think there is a war between the Son and the Father; but for the degradation of false gods, first and last, that*

always the Father calls himself God, and he understands that the Son necessarily is with him. And in chapter 4 he said: *For, since the Son by nature is uncreated, and the Lord of all things, and the creator, etc.*

Thirdly, they object that Jerome, whom they say for a long time resisted the truth, but finally was overcome by the clarity of Scripture, confessed that the Father is the one God; for, in Eph. 4:6 concerning the expression, *One God and Father of us all,* he says that it must be understood as being about God the Father. But Jerome in the same place refutes this calumny; for he says the Son is not excluded, when the Father is called the one God, just as the Father is not excluded when the Son is said to be the one Lord. *If,* he said, *as the Arians think, God the Father alone is God, by the same reasoning Jesus Christ is the only Lord, and so the Father will not be Lord, nor will the Son be God. But it cannot be true either that there is no Deity in domination, or domination in Deity. There is one God and there is one Lord, because the one divinity is the domination of the Father and the Son. Therefore there is only one Faith, because we believe in the same way in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit.*

Finally, they object to what Augustine says in book 6, chapter 9 on the Trinity, where he says this: *But then what shall we do with that testimony of the Lord? For He was speaking to the Father, and had named the Father as Him to whom He was speaking, when He says, And this is life eternal, that they may know You the one true God... however, we must see whether, when it is said to the Father, That they may know You the one true God, we are forced to understand it as if He wished to intimate that the Father alone is the true God; lest we should not understand any to be God, except the three together.* Here Augustine seems to say that we are forced to agree that the Father alone is true God. Hence the Transylvanians, exulting, in book 2, chapter 6 say that Augustine, by contradicting this truth, corroborates it. Similarly, not being able to endure the clear light, he also, though unwillingly, has admitted the truth.

But the miserable Transylvanians have been deceived by an equivocation. For, that proposition, *The Father alone is true God,* can have a two meanings. One of them is, *The Father alone is true God,* that is, *no person is true God but the Father.* The other meaning is, *The Father alone is true God,* that is, *the Father also separately and considered alone is still the true God.* The first meaning is Arian, and the Transylvanians have adopted it; the second is Catholic, and the one intended by Augustine, as is clear from the quoted words; for he says that perhaps the Father alone is called true God, lest we think that the name of God belongs only to the three persons taken together, that is, that it cannot be attributed separately to the three persons. Furthermore, in the same place Augustine explicitly excludes the Arians, who deny that the Son is true God; then he concludes his argument by saying: *Now the equality of the Trinity, and one and the same substance, has been demonstrated as briefly as we could do it.*

In the sixth century we have the fifth general Council, which in chapter 1 asserts the three persons of one essence, and in chapter 11 says anathema to Arius, Eunomius, etc. Likewise we have Fulgentius in his book on Faith to Peter, 3 books for Monimus, and a book answering the objections of the Arians. We have Vigilius Tridentinus in books 4 and 5 against Eutyches, and answering the arguments of Sabellius, Arius, and Photinus.

Finally, we have Boethius Severinus, who wrote a perceptive book on the Trinity. The Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 clearly misunderstand him, and claim that he teaches Sabellianism because he says that there is a repetition of the same being, not a diverse enumeration, when it is said that the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God. But having been deceived by the devil, they truly are raving mad. For. Boethius does not say that there is a repetition of the same person, but of the same Divinity, which we are forced necessarily to say, unless we want to introduce many gods like the pagans.

In the seventh century we have the sixth general Council. Likewise we have Gregory the Great in 3 books of his Pastoral Rule and Gregory Turonicus in the 6 books of his History. Also there is Isidore with his book on the Trinity.

In the eighth century we have the seventh general Council and the venerable Bede, who, in addition to other things, wrote a Commentary on Boethius's book on the Trinity. Also there is John Damascene in book 1, chapters 2,6 and 8 and almost the whole book

In the ninth century we have eighth general Council. There is also Photius, Theophylact, Haymo, and Rabanus on Romans 9 and Philippians 2 and on other places.

In the tenth century, which was the most obscure of all, we have Ambrose Ausbertus in his Commentary on Revelation, especially at the beginning and the end. Also there was Radulphus Flaviacensis on Leviticus 2.

In the eleventh century we have St. Anselm in his book on the Trinity. There was also Giselbertus in a book for Anselm on the dispute between the Church and the Synagogue.

In the twelfth century we have Richard of St. Victor in book 6 on the Trinity and St Bernard in letter 190 to Pope Innocent against Peter Abelard.

In the thirteenth century we have Lateran Council IV in chapter 1 and at the same time many outstanding theologians, so that also in all the following centuries, either they added commentaries to the Sentences of Peter Lombard, or they published their own Summas of theology, like Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and others.

In the fourteenth century there was the Council of Vienne; from it we have the constitution on Trinity and the Catholic Faith.

In the fifteenth century there was the Council of Florence; in the last session there is the decree of the procession of the Holy Spirit.

In the sixteenth century we have the Council of Trent, session 3. There the Faith in the consubstantial Holy Trinity is repeated, which is the one true God and has come down to us from the time of the Apostles. This is an outstanding argument of its truth; for the heresies have never survived for a long time.

CHAPTER XI

THE EIGHTH CLASS IS FROM THE SIBYLS

The Sibyls foretold many things more clearly than any of the prophets. But Justin, Athenagoras, Clement of Alexandria, Lactantius, Augustine, and other Ancients frequently cite the testimonies of the Sibyls. Actually, Clement in book 6 of the Stromata, before the middle, says that the Apostle Paul urged the Gentiles to read the Sibyls. A famous song exists of the Erythraean Sibyl, whose beginning letters make the sentence, *Jesus Christ, Son of God, Savior,* and it concludes with this distich:

Such is the name these mystic lines display;
Savior, eternal king, who bears our sins away.

And above he had spoken about the Christ who will come to judge:

Then the unbeliever and the believer will see God.

These songs can be read in the Oration of Constantine the Great to the assembly of the Saints, which is found in Eusebius after the life of Constantine. In this oration Constantine also says that Cicero knew these songs, and translated them into Latin. And although they are not found among the works of Cicero, nevertheless in book 2 on the divinity Cicero says that he saw the songs of the Sibyls, which rendered a certain sentence with the beginning letter of each verse; this type of verse in Greek is called an "acrostic." This indicates sufficiently that he read these songs, for there are no others in existence that signify something with the beginning letters.

Moreover, Lactantius in book 4, chapter 18, and Augustine in book 18, chapter 23 related these songs of the Sibyls to the divinity of Christ.

You fool, you did not recognize your God, but you crowned
Him with a crown of thorns, and gave him bitter gall. Also this:
And they will give God blows with unchaste hands.

Furthermore, in book 5 of the Sibyls, near the end, we read this:

When the house drives out the seed of David, in whose hands
Are the whole world, stars, sea and heaven. And after that:
For the healthy idea of your God wrongly flees from you, etc.
O happy tree on which God himself was hung, etc. And in book 7,
You do not know your merciful God, whom he washed of old
In the Jordan.

In book 8 the words of the angel to Mary are stated;

O virgin undefiled, receive God into your chaste womb.

CHAPTER XII

THE NINTH CLASS IS FROM DIVINE WITNESS OF VISIONS AND MIRACLES

The Holy Spirit, foreseeing that the Arian heresy would be repeated often, and cause much harm to the Church, wanted there to be abundant witness that it is a true heresy.

First of all, therefore, about fifty years before the appearance of the heresy of Arius, the Virgin Mary appeared to St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, and St. John the Evangelist was with her; at the command of the Virgin, John gave Gregory the confession of Faith, in which the Word is proclaimed to be true God, eternal, invisible, uncreated, along with the consubstantial Trinity. Gregory of Nyssa mentions this vision in his Oration on the praises of the same Thaumaturgus.

Secondly, a short time before the Arian heresy God revealed to St. Anthony, as Athanasius writes in his life of Anthony, the horrible evils that Arius would inflict on the Church. Because of this it happened that Anthony would not allow any Arian to ascend his mountain, but he drove him away from the whole mountain like the plague.

Thirdly, about the same time Christ, with his robe torn from top to bottom, appeared to the martyr St. Peter, the Bishop of Alexandria while he was in prison. And when St Peter asked him what his meant, he received this reply: Arius did this, because he has separated my people from me. Bede writes about this in the Martyrology for November 25.

Fourthly, Arius himself at the public baths in Constantinople, seized by a sudden dissolution of his innards, poured out all of his intestines and died. Athanasius writes about this in Oration 1 against Arius, Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 13 of his History, Gaudentius in his letter to Paul, Epiphanius in heresies 68 and 69, and others. Athanasius adds in his letter to Serapion, his brother, before this took place, that Arius has sworn an oath to Constantine that he embraced the Catholic Faith, but that he heard this from Constantine: *If your Faith be right, you have done well to swear; but if your Faith be impious, and you have sworn, God will judge of you according to your oath.* Then, since Arius wanted to enter the Church by force, Athanasius writes that in the same place, St. Alexander, the Bishop of Constantinople, prayed to God, that if he allowed Arius to enter the Church, he should take him out of this world; but if he spared the Church, he should remove Arius. From this we understand that it did not happen by chance that Arius should die such a horrible death, but clearly by the singular providence of God, who for that reason wanted to fulfill both the threat of a pious prince and the prayer of a holy Bishop. *The Lord himself,* Athanasius said, *showing himself to be the judge, condemned the Arian heresy*

Fifthly, when the Arian Bishop Lucius was persecuting Catholics everywhere, monks performed miracles with these words: *In the name of Jesus, whom Lucius is persecuting, stand up and walk.* Ruffinus reports this in book 11, chapter 4 of his History.

Sixthly, St. Hilary, driven into exile by the Arians, freed a certain island of serpents by the command of his voice alone and by his presence. Afterwards he also raised a dead man to life, as Fortunatus writes in his life of him.

Seventhly, St. Martin, as Sulpitius reports, resisted the Arians so vehemently that he was publicly beaten with rods and driven from his homeland, while in the meantime he shines with innumerable daily miracles.

In the eighth place, St. Basil, when there was a question about a certain church—whether the Catholics or the Arians should possess it, he proposed a condition, namely, that the church should be sealed with strong bolts, and it would belong to those who, praying according to their faith, were able to open it by their words alone and without the use of any external force. Having accepted this condition, first the Arians, praying for a long time according to their faith, were not able to open the Church. Then while Basil was praying with the Catholics, immediately the doors of the Church were opened with such force, as if those words were some kind of thunder. Amphilochius writes about this in his life of Basil.

In the ninth place, when the Arian Empress Justina was persecuting Ambrose and the Catholics, God revealed to Ambrose the location of the incorrupt bodies of Gervase and Protase, and by them he cured a blind man and performed many more miracles. Augustine says in book 9, chapter 7 of his Confessions that this caused confusion among the Arians, and this is also evident from the fact that the Arians, as much as they could, lied about those miracles, as Ambrose himself says in his sermon on Saints Gervase and Protase.

In the tenth place, Victor Uticensis writes in book 1 on the Wandalica persecution, when the holy martyrs for the Catholic Faith were scourged by the Arians to the laying bare of their bones, it often happened that on the following day by a divine miracle they were seen to be unharmed. The same author writes in book 2 that a blind man was cured by St. Eugene during the time when the Arians were fiercely harassing Catholics. In book 3 he says that some Catholic men, at the command of the Arian King, had their tongues cutoirt, but that in spite of that they spoke clearly for as long as they lived. St. Gregory in book 3, chapter 32 of his Dialogues also mentions this miracle, and he says that he had spoken with an old Bishop who had seen one of them speaking without a tongue.

In the eleventh place, the same Gregory in chapters 29, 30 and 31 of the same book speaks about three miracles, which occurred during his time. The first one happened in the city of Spoleto. For, when the Arian Bishop entered the Church of St. Paul, and wanted to dedicate the Church to his error, the Catholics out of fear extinguished all the lights and carefully closed the Church. But when the Arian with his followers approached and attempted a forced entry, immediately all the doors at the same time with a loud noise opened by themselves, and all the candles were ignited with a bright heavenly light; at the same time the Bishop was struck with blindness, and all were moved with such fear that they did not dare to enter, but in their confusion they took the blinded Bishop back to his home. The second miracle took place in Rome. For, when St. Gregory had reconciled a certain Church, which had belonged to the Arians, and had bought in the relics of the saints, the devil appeared in horrible shape and left the Church. Then a bright cloud descended over the altar and at the same time a sweet odor was diffused throughout the place, and all the lamps were ignited by divine power. The third miracle occurred in Spain, where, since Hermenegildus, the son of the King, had been killed by his Arian

father because of the Faith, during the night lighted lamps were seen to surround him and the singing of angels was heard by many.

In the twelfth place, as Gregory Turonicus writes in book 3, chapter 2 of his History of the Franks, in Africa a certain Cyrola, patriarch of the Arians, was persecuting the Catholics. At the same time there were three holy Bishops there—Eugene, Vindemialis and Longinus—who along with others were resisting him and were famous for performing miracles. The heretic also wanted to perform a miracle. Therefore, he paid out fifty gold pieces to a certain man, so that he should pretend to be blind; but while Cyrola was walking down the street, the man who was simulating blindness asked Cyrola for help. Cyrola approached him and touched his eyes, commanding him to see as a sign of the truth which he was preaching; but suddenly such a great fever seized the eyes of that miserable man that he was forced to cover his eyes with his hands to prevent them from falling out of his head. But then he revealed the deceit, and having confessed the Catholic Faith with a loud voice, he was immediately cured by St. Eugene with the sign of the Cross.

Therefore with these and other divine examples it is demonstrated sufficiently that the opinion of those is hostile to God who deny that the Son of God is true God. But now it is time to move on to the confirmation of the divinity of the Holy Spirit; this was the fifth part of our argumentation.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IS DEMONSTRATED

Therefore with regard to the fifth point, it is to be proved that the Holy Spirit is true God; although it is something the adversaries deny, still they do not make a big thing out of it, for they contend for the excellence of the Father. But if that excellence should be taken away because of the confession of another person equal to the Father, they believe that it makes little difference whether that is by one person or by two. Therefore, Valentinus Gentilis almost always said that there is no question about the Holy Spirit. However, the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 deny that the Holy Spirit is to be adored or called God, but they do not really prove that, nor do they refute the contrary objections. Therefore we will be content to prove it from the same class of arguments with which we proved the divinity of the Son, but we will do it more briefly.

The first class is from the Old Testament, which can supply many places, but because we want to keep it brief, one reference will suffice. Therefore divine Scripture says this in 2 Sam. 23:1-2: *Now these are the last words of David... The Spirit of the Lord speaks by me, his word is upon my tongue. The God of Israel has spoken, the Rock of Israel has said to me: when one rules justly over men, etc.* There you see clearly that the very one who is said to be the Spirit of the Lord is said to be the God of Israel. From this it follows that he is true God.

The second class is from the New Testament, which could also supply many places, if it were necessary; but this one will be enough, where the Lord says to the Apostles in Matt. 28:19: *Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* For the Lord would not join the Holy Spirit together with the Father and the Son, if he were a creature. Then, as Gregory Nazianzen reasons in Oration 5 on Theology: How could the Holy Spirit regenerate us by Baptism, and make us God-like, unless he were himself true God? For, *it is the Lord who gives grace and glory,* as David says in Ps. 84.

The third class from both Testaments taken together presents us with clear testimony in order to prove the divinity of the Holy Spirit. For, the very same one whom Isaiah calls the Lord of hosts, and whom all confess to be true God, the Apostle says that he is the Holy Spirit. But let us listen to the words of Scripture. In Isa. 6:9: the Lord said: *Go, and say to this people: Hear and hear, but do not understand, etc.* And in Acts 28:25-26: *The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through the prophet: Go to this people, and say, You shall indeed hear but never understand, etc.* Moreover, all the prophets, when they proclaimed their sermons to the people, did they not repeat the same thing: *Thus says the Lord God?* But in 2 Pet. 1:21 it is said: *Moved by the Holy Spirit holy men of God spoke.* Therefore that Lord God was the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, Zechariah says in Luke 1:68: *Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, etc.* And shortly after that: *As he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets of old.* With these words Zechariah could not have expressed more clearly that the Holy Spirit is the Lord God of Israel; the adversaries passim bear witness that the true God is signified with these words.

The fourth class is from the names, and from this class there are three main arguments. The first one is negative, because nowhere in Scripture is the Holy Spirit said to be a creature or to be something made, when however in many places all the principal creatures are enumerated, as in Dan. 5 in the Canticle of the youths; this also occurs in Ps. 103 and 148, where all creatures are urged to praise God, and by name the angels, waters, men beasts, etc. But there is no mention of the Holy Spirit. Thus also in Col. 1:16 the most noble creatures are listed—thrones, dominions, principalities, authorities. And in 1 Pet. 3:22: Angels, authorities and powers are mentioned in order to show that Christ is greater than all of them. In these places the Holy Spirit surely should have been named, if he were a creature, and inferior to the Son of God, as the adversaries teach. But we see that the Holy Spirit is never named with creatures, but always with the Father and the Son. Many of the Fathers make this argument. Justin in the book on the right Faith uses it at the beginning. Basil does the same in chapter 18 in his treatise on the Holy Spirit; Epiphanius in Ancora near the beginning; and Chrysostom in volume 5 of his homilies on the words, *Then also the Son himself will be subjected to him* (1 Cor. 15:28).

The second argument is taken from the name itself of God; for only the true God in Scripture is said to be God absolutely, as was shown above from Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 6, but the Holy Spirit is called God absolutely. Acts 5:3: *Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?... You have not lied to men but to God.* Behold the express name of God attributed to the Holy Spirit contrary to the lie of the Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 where they say explicitly that the Holy Spirit is never called God.

The third argument is from the admission of the adversaries; for, the Arians had deleted from their codices the words of John 4:24, *God is Spirit,* as Ambrose says in book 3, chapter 11 of his work on the Holy Spirit. Therefore they thought that the Holy Spirit is called God in the Scriptures. For, if they thought the meaning is, *God is Spirit,* that is, *God has a spiritual nature,* why did they delete those words? But their erasure harmed them more than the letter of God; since those words of God are not necessarily to be understood to be about the person of the Holy Spirit; but that erasure cries out that the heretical Arians had committed themselves to a false meaning, and sinned against the Holy Spirit, since they preferred to delete the Holy Scriptures rather than abandon their own errors.

The fifth class is established from the attributes: Only God is immense and everywhere; but about the Holy Spirit we read in Ps. 139: *Whither shall I go from your Spirit?* And in Wisdom 1:7: *The Spirit of the Lord has filled the world.* Likewise, only God is omnipotent; but about the Holy Spirit we read in Wis. 7:23, a *Spirit having all power.* Similarly, only God knows himself perfectly; but we read about the Holy Spirit in 1 Cor. 2:11: *No one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God.* And again: *The Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God.* Likewise, only God is good; but about the Holy Spirit we read in Ps. 143:10: *Let thy good Spirit lead me on a level path.* Finally, only God has a temple; but about the Holy Spirit we read in 1 Cor. 6:19: *Your members are a temple of the Holy Spirit.* And so: *Glorify God in your body* While treating this text St. Augustine said in book 1, chapter 6 of his book on the Trinity:

The Holy Spirit is not a creature; because we *must needs owe to Him, of whom our body is the temple, that service wherewith God only is to be served, which in Greek is called* λατρεία. And in book 1, last chapter, of his work against Maximinus he said: *Since you are listening, do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit in you?* And in the same place: *Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Therefore since you hear this, do not deny that the Holy Spirit is God, lest you make the members of the creator the temple of a creature.*

The sixth class is from his works. First, creation is the work of God alone, and still you read in Job 33:4: *The Spirit of God made me.* And Ps. 33:6; *By the word of the Lord the heavens were made, and all their host by the Spirit of his mouth.* And Ps. 103:30: *When thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created.*

Second, to conserve things belongs to God alone, and still we read in Wis. 1:7: *The Spirit of the Lord has filled the world, and this* πνεῦμα, *which holds all things together, etc.*

Third, to save and to justify belongs to God alone, but still you read in 1 Cor. 6:11: *You were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.*

Fourth, to predict the future and to search hearts belongs to God alone, and still you read in 2 Pet. 1:21: *Moved by the Holy Spirit holy men of God spoke.*

Fifth, to work miracles belongs to God alone, but Christ himself drove out devils in the Spirit of God, Matt. 12:28; and Paul in 1 Cor. 12:4ff. says that the Holy Spirit is the author of the gift of tongues, of healings, etc. And in Heb. 2:4 he says that all the miracles worked by the Apostles were gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Sixth, to govern the Church with absolute authority belongs to God alone; but the Holy Spirit governs the Church, which clearly is the kingdom of Christ, as the absolute Lord, and not less that the Father and the Son. For example, Acts 10:19: *The Spirit said to Peter... accompany them without hesitation, for I have sent them.* In Acts. 13:2 the Holy Spirit says: *Set apart for me Barnabas and Saul for the work to which I have called them.* And in the same place: *So they, being sent out by the Holy Spirit.* Acts 15:28: *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no great burden.* Acts 16:7: *Forbidden by the Holy Spirit to preach the word in Asia.* Acts 20: 28: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of the Lord.* 1 Cor. 12:11: *All these are inspired by one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills.*

The seventh class will consist of a comparison of the Holy Spirit with Christ; for, if we prove that the Holy Spirit is greater than Christ, inasmuch as Christ is a man, then it will have been proved that the Holy Spirit is one God with the Father.

Therefore, that the Holy Spirit is greater than Christ the man is demonstrated by all those arguments by which the adversaries prove that God the Father is greater than Christ. The Father, who sent him, is greater than the man Christ (John 8:18), but the Holy Spirit sent him also; for thus we read in Isa. 48:16: *And now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit.* The Father consecrated the Son, John 10:36: *Whom the Father consecrated and sent into the world.* The Holy Spirit also consecrated him, Isa. 61:1-2 and Luke 4:18: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the*

poor. Likewise the Father brought about the Incarnation of the Son, Rom. 8:3: *He sent his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh.* Matt. 1:20: *That which is conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit.* Similarly, in the power of the Father the Son worked miracles, John 14:10: *The Father who dwells in me does his works.* And in Matt. 12:28 he says this of the Holy Spirit: *If it is by the Spirit of God that I cast out demons.* Also the Father offers the Son to death, Rom. 8:32: *He did not spare his only Son.* The Holy Spirit did the same thing, Heb. 9:14: *Who through the Holy Spirit offered himself.* Finally, Paul says the same thing about the Spirit in Rom. 8:11 : *If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you.* The result is that it is more serious to sin against the Holy Spirit than against Christ the man (Matt. 12:32); from this it clearly follows that the Holy Spirit is greater than the humanity of Christ, and therefore that he is true God.

The eighth class is from the Fathers. The Fathers already cited speak about the divinity of Christ and in the same place almost all of them also about the Holy Spirit. Therefore here it will be sufficient to note the name of those who write explicitly about the divinity of the Holy Spirit: Athanasius in the letter to Serapion, Basil in books 3 and 5 against Eunomius and in his book to Amphilochius about the Holy Spirit, Nazianzen in book 5 on Theology, Nyssa in the book for Eustachius that the Holy Spirit is God; Epiphanius in Heresies 74, Didymus in two books on the Holy Spirit; Cyril of Jerusalem in Catechetics 16 and 17, Chrysostom in his homilies on the Holy Spirit, Cyril of Alexandria in book 7 on the Trinity and books 13 and 14 on Theology and in a book on the Holy Spirit; Hilary in book 12 on the Trinity, Ambrose in three books on the Holy Spirit, Augustine in book 1, chapter 6 on the Trinity and in book 1, near the end, against Maximinus, and St Thomas in chapters 16 and 27 of book 4 of his *Summa Contra Gentiles.*

The ninth class is from miracles. But since the miracles, which were done to confinn the divinity of Christ, confirm also the divinity of the Holy Spirit, we will only repeat the last miracle mentioned above. Therefore thus writes Gregory Turonicus in book 2, chapter 3 of his History of the Franks: *At that time there were with St. Eugene prudent and holy men, the Bishops Vindemialis and Longinus, of equal grade but not of equal virtue. For, at that time St. Vindemialis is said to have raised a dead man to life; Longinus brought health to many sick people; Eugene also cured not only the blindness of eyes, but also that of minds. When he saw this, an evil bishop of the Arians, having called to himself a certain man who had been deceived by the same error according to which he lived, he said to him: I cannot bear that these Bishops perform many signs among the people, and all follow them while neglecting me. Now I want you to agree to what I command. Take these fifty gold pieces and sit in the town square, through which I will be passing; put your hands over your closed eyes, and when I am passing by with my followers cry out with a loud voice, saying: "I beseech you, blessed Cyrola, leader of our religion, that you manifest your glory and virtue to open my eyes so that I may again see the light which I have lost. "After receiving that command and while sitting in the square, and the heretic was passing by, the one who thought he should mock God, cried out with a loud voice, saying: "Hear me, blessed Cyrola, hear me holy priest of God. Look at my blindness. I am using some medications, which often other blind persons received from you, which lepers have made use of, which the dead themselves have felt beforehand.*

adjure you by the power you have that you restore my lost sight, because I am depressed by this grave blindness. " For, being ignorant of the truth, he spoke the truth, because cupidity had blinded him, and he thought that through money he could laugh at the power of almighty God.

Then the bishop of the heretics turning himself slightly, elated by his vanity and pride, as if he were about to triumph in his virtue, placed his hand over the man's eyes and said: "According to our faith, which we rightly believe, let your eyes be opened; and immediately as this impious deed was taking place laughter broke out in the square, and the deceit of the bishops became public; for such great pain seized his eyes, so that he could hardly contain them with his fingers lest they fall out of his head.

Then the miserable man began to cry out and say: " Woe to me, a miserable man, because I have been deceived by an enemy of the divine law. Woe to me because I wanted to mock God through money, and I accepted fifty gold pieces, to perpetrate this crime. " And then he said to the bishop: " Here is your gold, return my sight to me, which I lost because of your deceit, and I beseech you, glorious Christians, do not despise a miserable man, but quickly come to his aid. For now I know truly that God will not be mocked. " Then the saints of God, moved by mercy, said: "If you believe, all things are possible to him who believes. " But he cried out with a loud voice: "He who does not believe that Christ the Son of God and the Holy Spirit have equal substance and divinity with God the Father, which I proclaim today, let him suffer. "And then he added: "I believe in God the Father Almighty; I believe in the Son of God, Christ Jesus, who is equal to the Father I believe in the Holy Spirit consubstantial with the Father and the Son, and co-etema with them. "

Hearing this, and deferring to each other because of mutual respect, a holy contention arose among them as to who would make the sign of the blessed Cross on his eyes. Vindemialis and Longinus urged Eugene, but he exhorted them to place their hands on the blind man. When they had done it, and had held their hands over his head, Eugene, making the sign of the Cross over the eyes of the blind man, said: "In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit of the true God, whom we confess is three in one equality and omnipotence, may your eyes be opened. "And immediately the pain left him, and he was restored to him previous health. Those are his words. And these points suffice for the Holy Spirit.

Now we come to the last part of the debate, and we will briefly refute the arguments of the adversaries.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FIRST ARGUMENT OF THE HERETICS IS ANSWERED

Therefore the first objection of the Transylvanians in book 1, chapter 1 is this. Christ and the Apostles had predicted that the Antichrist was to come immediately after the death of Christ, and abolish the true Faith of Christ. But we see after the death of Christ in the whole world that God is adored as three in persons and one in essence; therefore, either the Faith of the Trinity is the Faith of the Antichrist, or certainly Christ and the Apostles have lied.

They try to prove the proposition with these testimonies. John 5:43: *I have come in my Father i name, and you do not receive me; if another comes in his own name, him you will receive,* John 9:4-5: *I must work while it is day; night comes, when no one can work As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world.* Luke 21:8: *Take heed that you are not led astray; for many will come in my name, saying, "I am he" and, "The time is at hand." Do not go after them.* Take heed, they said, how Christ says that the time of his dissolution is at hand. Acts 20:29: *I know that after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock.* Col. 2:8: *See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy, etc.* What is greater than philosophy but debates about essence, hypostasis and relations? 2 Thess. 2:7: *For the mystery of lawlessness is already at work, etc.* 1 John 4:3: *Every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of Antichrist, of which you heard that it was coming, and now it is in the world already.* There note that it is not said that he came in the flesh, lest perhaps we should think that a divine person descended, and assumed flesh; but in the flesh so that we might understand that Christ is nothing other than flesh, that is, a man. Finally, in the letter of Jude the ungodly persons, who deny God and Christ, are said at that time to have already appeared.

I respond that the cleverness of the devil is amazing, since he tries to refute us with an ancient argument of Catholics and one that has merited the agreement of the whole world. But it will be easy to demolish this first objection. For, it is certain that the proposition, on which the whole argument rests, is totally false. For, if the true Faith was to be totally abolished immediately after the death of Christ, why did Christ come? Why did he labor? Why did he want to die? In order to accomplish nothing? But this would have been stupid, which could not be part of supreme wisdom. Then, if it was to be totally future in this way, what good would it do to warn us to avoid seducers, since we could in no way prevent the whole world from being perverted. Finally, what happened to those promises of Daniel 2:44 and Luke 1:33: *And of his kingdom there will be no end?* And that of Christ in Matt. 16:18: *And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* And Matt. 28:20: *I am with you always to the close of the age.* Also, what has become of those promises that all nations will believe in Christ? Gen. 22:18: *By your descendants shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves.* Ps. 2:8: *T will make the nations your heritage.* Ps. 72:11: *May all kings fall down before him, all nations serve him.* For it is necessaiy that all these promises are false, if the kingdom of Christ is to be destroyed at its very beginning; but the testimonies cited by the adversaries do not prove anything.

To the first quote I say that it is not stated there that the Antichrist will come immediately, nor that the Faith of Christ is to be completely abolished; but it is said that the Antichrist will come at his own time, namely, and that he will come in his own name, not in the name of the Father. But our Christ, whom the whole world worships, has a Father, he acknowledges his Father and comes in the name of the Father. Finally, Christ there is addressing the Jews alone, for when he said: *This is why the Jews sought to kill him,* he then adds: *Therefore Jesus said to them, etc.* But the Jews did not receive our Christ, but opposed him with all their strength; they do not believe that their future Messiah is their God and man, but merely a man. Therefore, the one about whom Christ is speaking is not our Christ who is true God, and whom the Gentiles have received, but it is the Antichrist, whom the Jews sometimes receive for the Messiah. It is in this way that this passage is explained by all the interpreters, like Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril and others.

To the second quote I say that there by the word "night" is not understood the time that was, and is from the Ascension of Christ; as if the day only was the time in which Christ lived corporeally in the world, but after that it was always night. For, if that were the case, after his Ascension no one could have worked, and therefore no one could be converted and believe: *This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he has sent* (John 6:29). But if no one can believe, why do the Transylvanian ministers work so hard to persuade us concerning their faith?

Therefore, there Christ calls the whole time of this life "day," and the course of all the centuries until the end of the world, in which it is possible to work in a salvific way; but the "night" is the time of the future life: *For there is no work or thought... in Sheol, to which you are going,* says the wise man in Eccles. 9:10. The statement, *As long as I am in the world, I am the light of the world,* is not opposed to this, because Christ is now in the world according to what he says in Matt. 28:20: *Behold, I am with you always, to the close of the age.* And truly he is in the world now, because he is present now to all through grace, and he shines on the just and the unjust. But after the judgment he will no longer be in the world, because he will not shine on the unjust. Hence we read in Isa. 55:6: *See the Lord while he may be found, call upon him while he is near.* And David says in Ps. 94:8: *O that today you would hearken to his voice! Harden not your hearts.* And this is indeed the explanation of Augustine and Chrysostom in their Commentaries on this place.

To the third quote it could be said with Cajetan that the phase "the time is at hand" is not asserted by Christ, but refers to the saying of the seducers, who said that the day of judgment has already come. Hence Paul warns us in 2 Thess. 2:2: *Do not be quickly shaken in mind... to the effect that the day of the Lord has come, etc.* Moreover I say that Christ is surely saying that the time has approached, not indeed of judgment, or of the Antichrist, or of the abolition of his Faith, but of many seducers, who usurp for themselves the name of Christ, for of such a nature were Simon the magician at the time of the Apostles, and after him Menander, for both said they were the Christ, according to Irenaeus in book 1, chapters 20 and 21. And Josephus in book 20, chapters 4,11,12 and 14 mentions many who, during his time, deceived the Jews and preached themselves, as

if they were the Saviors of Israel.

To the fourth quote I say that Paul is speaking about heretics, who were to come out of Asia not long afterwards. For he says this: *And from among your own selves* (he was speaking to Asians) *will arise men speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them, etc.* There is no doubt that this was fulfilled in Montanus, in the disciples of Montanus and in other Asiatic heretics. On this see Eusebius in the version of Ruffinus in book 5, chapter 14ff. of his History.

To the fifth quote I say that Paul is addressing the men of that time, because the Scholastics had not yet been born who dispute about the Trinity. Moreover, philosophy does not teach one God in three persons; for they were never able, by the light of nature reason alone, to investigate or arrive at such a sublime mystery. And our Teachers do not argue philosophically to prove the Trinity, but they use philosophy to refute the sophisms of the philosophers. Therefore Paul is speaking about the philosophy of the pagans, who were popular at that time, who denied the resurrection, and were promising life without Christ.

Regarding the rest I say that the Apostles predicted the coming of heretics, who were on the scene shortly after that time, like the Ebionites, Marcionists and others, whom they also call Antichrists, not because there were that exceptional Antichrist who will come at the end of the world, but because they were his precursors, and were like him in opposing Christ; just as there is one supreme and exceptional Christ, and still all the prophets and kings were called Christs in the Old Testament, according to the words in Ps. 105:15: *Touch not my anointed ones.* And this is the mystery of iniquity which began during the time of Paul, because then began the heresy of Simon the magician and of others like him.

CHAPTER XV

THE SECOND ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED

The second objection of the Transylvanians is found in book 1, chapters 1 and 3 and in the book explaining chapter 1 of the Gospel according to John. At the time of the Apostles, Ebion and Cerinthus taught that the eternal Christ descended on the man Jesus, as Irenaeus says in book 3, chapter 19. And it is not true, what is said commonly, that the Ebionites taught that Christ is a mere man. Therefore, they are the true Ebionites who say that Christ is a composite from two natures.

I respond that this also was a very clever trick of the Devil, whereby the heresy of Ebion, which the Transylvanians really embrace, is attributed to us. Therefore, I say that the true heresy of Ebion was that the Son of Mary was a mere man, and that at the age of 30 another person descended on him and dwelt in him, whom Ebion said is the Christ. And so it was in this way that Jesus was united to Christ by a joining together and an indwelling, which is the same thing the Transylvanians teach.

Now in order to refute their lie we will present the testimonies of the older Fathers who tell us that Ebion said that the Son of Mary was a mere man. Ignatius in his letter to the Philadelphians said: *If anyone confesses Christ Jesus, and thinks he is a pure man—that man is a serpent, lacking reason, and his name is Ebion.* Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 11: *According to no thinking of the heretics did the Word become flesh.* And in book 1, chapters 25 and 26 he says, according to Ebion and Cerinthus, that Jesus was born a mere man, but then that Christ descended on him in the form of a dove in order to dwell in him. Tertullian in chapter 11 of his treatise on the flesh of Christ said: *This opinion will be very suitable for Ebion, who holds Jesus to be a mere man.* And in his book on prescription against heretics he said in chapter 45: *Cerinthus maintains that Christ is only a man without divinity.* Eusebius in book 3, chapter 27 of his History says that some of the Ebionites made Christ the son of Joseph, and some of the Virgin alone; but all of them agree that he did not exist before Mary. Jerome in his book on Illustrious Men, in the chapter on John, says that St. John was forced by the Bishops of Asia to write his Gospel, and to make known the eternal generation of Christ, because of the Ebionites who, at that time, were teaching that Christ is a mere man. Augustine in his treatise on heresies (10) said: *The Ebionites teach that Christ is only a man.* John Cassian, and not a few others, says the same thing in book 1 on the Incarnation.

CHAPTER XVI

THE THIRD ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED

The third objection is in book 2, chapter 6. The name of God is not the name of his essence, but of his dignity and authority, as is evident, because in the Scriptures princes and judges are called gods. But the Father of Christ has supreme authority over absolutely all things, also over Christ himself. Christ has authority over all things, except the Father, therefore the Father is the supreme God simply, but Christ is the supreme God after the Father. For, Christ says in John 14:28: *The Father is greater than I.* And in John 6:38: *I have come down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him who sent me.* And in 1 Cor. 15:28: Paul says that Christ is subject to the Father, but all things to Christ, with the Father alone excepted, who subjects all things to him.

I respond that the name of God, if we look at the word etymologically, does not signify authority but providence. For the word θεός is from θεάσθαι, that is, *to see,* or from θεειν, that is, *to run,* because he assists all, as Damascene says in book 1, chapter 12, unless the explanation of Theodoretus is more pleasing; for he says that this name was invented by those who think that the stars are Gods, and since the stars are always running, they named God as if he were running. But in Hebrew the primary name of God is mm from ΠΗ , that is, *to be,* and also D'nbx which is translated *God* from rÙN which means *to swear,* because by God one swears an oath; but whatever the etymology may be, it is certain that this name was not devised in order to signify only authority, but something supreme and outstanding, otherwise God would not be eternal, since from eternity there was nothing over which God could have authority. Moreover, it is also false that the Son of God as God is subject to the being of the Father, or is a person less than the Father. Since as God he is subject to nothing, but like the Father he rules over absolutely everything outside himself, because he is equal to the Father (see John 5:19 and Phil. 2:6).

Therefore many ancient authors respond to the first quote from John 14:28 that the Father is said to be greater than the Son by reason of being his principle, not by reason of nature. For a certain authority is noted in the fact that the Father is the principle of the son, not conversely. Thus Basil in his book on Eunomius, Nazianzen in Oration 4 on Theology, Hilary in book 9 on the Trinity and the book on the Council. This proof should not be completely rejected, however we are not forced to accept it, since we can more easily and probably explain it to be about the Son by reason of his human nature; it is in this way that Chrysostom, Cyril, Augustine explain this text of John; Gaudentius does the same in his letter to Paul.

You can add to this the fact that Chrysostom on this text, and Cyril in book 2, chapter 3 of his Thesaurus, and Augustine in book 2, chapter 7 on the Trinity, mention also the first explanation, and nevertheless prefer this second one, and they do this for two reasons. First, because if the Father were said to be greater than the Son because he is his principle, then both the Father and the Son would be said to be greater than the Holy Spirit for the same reason; but we read this nowhere. Similarly, the Lord says: *I go to*

the Father, because the Father is greater than I; therefore the Son is less in that nature in which he goes to the Father, however he does not go as God but as man. Add to this the testimony of the Athanasian Creed, where we read about the Son of God: *He is equal to (he Father according to his divinity, less than the Father according to his humanity.*

The same thing can be responded to the second quote. For, Christ comes to do the will of his Father, not his own will, that is, inasmuch as he has as man a human will subject to the divine will, which he himself has the same as God. But you will say: The Lord came down from heaven to do the will of the Father; but he did not descend from heaven as man, for as man he never existed in heaven; therefore he came down as God; therefore, as God he is less than the Father.

I respond that the descent of the Son of God is nothing other than his emptying himself, and the assumption of the form of a slave; therefore the Son of God himself, who came down from heaven, was obedient to the Father, but he was obedient, not according to the form of God, which he had in heaven, but according to the form of a slave, which he assumed by his descent to earth.

Regarding the third quote: *Then the Son himself will also be subjected, etc.,* there were some who said, Christ being subjected to God after the day of judgment, means that the human nature of Christ will then be changed into God, and completely absorbed by the divinity. Augustine mentions this in book 1, chapters 8 and 10 on the Trinity, but this view is so absurd that it does not need a refutation; for, the contrary follows from the proposition of Paul, because subjection implies some distinction. Gregory of Nyssa, and Chrysostom in his treatise on this proposition of Paul, and Cyril in book 10, chapter 8 of his Thesaurus, say that Paul is talking about the Church, or about Christ as he is in his members. Accordingly, the meaning is this: then finally it will happen that the whole body of Christ, that is, the whole Church will be seen as subject to God, with not one member remaining rebellious or insolent.

But what Paul says seems to be opposed to this explanation, that is, that he will be subject to the Father to whom the Father will subject all things—but that is the Son in his person. The Commentaries of Ambrose, Oecumenius, and Theophylact accept this statement of Paul absolutely, and they say that this subjection does not signify servitude, but harmony with the Father and the procession of the Son from the Father. Hence the Son is said to be subject, because he is from the Father, not opposed to him. But it is not necessary to fall back on these difficulties, for we can, with Ambrose in book 5, chapter 6 on Faith, and Augustine in book 1, chapter 8 on the Trinity, and Theodoretus, Primasius, Sedulius and others on this text, simply explain it as being about the human nature of Christ, which truly will be subject to God.

But why does he say: *Then the Son himself will also be subjected?* Will then Christ the man begin to be subject to God his Father? Was he not more subject when he was obedient unto death?

I respond that the "then" has a certain emphasis, for this is the meaning: even then in the final glory, Christ as man will be subject to God. All the Greeks point out that Paul is writing to the Corinthians, who shortly before had abandoned the myths of the Gentiles, who teach that the gods habitually fight among themselves, and that Saturn was

driven from his kingdom by his son Jupiter. Therefore, since Paul had said that Christ will overcome every principality and power, the Corinthians should not think according to their myths that the Father also is to be reduced in dignity by Christ, as Saturn was supplanted by his son Jupiter. Therefore he adds that all things are to be made subject to Christ, with the exception of him who subjects all things to Christ. And not only these things will be subject, but also Christ himself when in triumph, after he has done such things, is going to be subject to his own Father.

CHAPTER XVII

THE FOURTH ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED

The fourth objection is from the same book 2, chapter *6.* The Father alone is the one true God, as the Lord himself says in John 17:3: *That they may know thee the only true God.* And Paul in 1 Cor. 8:6: *For us there is one God, the Father.* And 1 Tim. 2:5: *There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men.* Therefore, if the Father alone is the one only true God, certainly it follows that the Son is not true God.

He confirms this argument with these sophisms: Christ is the unique Son of the true God; therefore, whoever does not have Christ the Son is not the one true God. But the Trinity does not have Christ the Son. Therefore the Trinity is not the one true God.

Moreover, Christ is the mediator of the one true God; therefore whoever does not have the mediator is not the one true God. But the Trinity does not have the mediator, but only the Father, otherwise the same one would be the mediator of himself. Therefore the Trinity is not true God, but only the Father. And this is confirmed, because Christ did not teach us to invoke the Trinity, but his Father; and formerly all the prayers of the Church were directed to the Father; concerning this there is the decree of the Council of Carthage III, chapter 23, for which there is no other reason except that the Father alone has a mediator.

I respond to the first quote in two ways. First, with Chrysostom, Cyril, and Augustine in their comments on this text, and with Ambrose in book 5, chapter 2 on Faith, I say that the word "only" is not restricted to the Father, but applies also to the Son. For, John says: *And Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent,* so that this is the order of the words, that they may know you, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent as the only true God. And Chrysostom cites a similar text from 1 Cor. 9:6: *Or is it only Barnabas and I who have no right to refrain from working for a living?* There the word "only" does not exclude Barnabas, but includes him.

Secondly and more easily I say with Hilary in book 9 on the Trinity that only the Father here is said to be true God, but that in the Father is understood also the Son and the Holy Spirit, who are persons of the same essence with the Father, so that the word "only" excludes only creatures. But when this is added: *And Jesus Christ whom you have sent,* it is said about Christ as he is man. Therefore, the meaning is this: *This is eternal life,* that is, *this is the way in this life, and the way of arriving at eternal life, that men know through Faith you the only true God,* that is, *you the Father, who are the God who alone has true divinity;* and in addition, *that they know the one mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ whom you have sent.*

I respond to the second quote in the same way. For the phrase "one God" excludes false gods, not the Son; just as what follows, "and one Lord Jesus Christ," excludes false lords, not the Father. To the third quote I say: "one God" in this text means the whole Trinity, from which Christ as mediator is distinguished, that is, as man; therefore Paul added the words "the man Christ Jesus."

For the first sophism, the first consequence is denied, for it is similar to this: Peter

is the son of one true man; therefore whoever does not have the son Peter, is not a true man. For although the deity is not something universal like humanity, still it is in several supposits (i.e., persons), and therefore it has the force of a universal.

For the second sophism, I deny the assumption, that the Trinity does not have a mediator; for, Christ is mediator as man, not as God, and therefore he is the mediator not only of the Father and of the Holy Spirit, but also of himself, inasmuch as he himself is God. But there will be a special consideration of this point in the last book.

For the third sophism, on the use of prayer, I admit that often the prayers of the Church are directed to the Father, because in this way they can more suitably be concluded with the words, *through Jesus Christ your Son;* however, in the "Father" we are invoking all three persons, as Tertullian teaches in his book on Prayer, and as is clear from the conclusion: *Who lives and reigns with you in the unity of the Holy Spirit, one God, etc.* But it is false that Christ wanted only the Father to be invoked; for, in John 14:14 Christ says: *If you ask anything in my name, I will do it.* And in Matt. 28:19 he commands all nations to be baptized, *in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit:* here what is he commanding but that the Trinity be invoked? And in the Greek liturgies of Basil and Chrysostom, and also in our Latin liturgy, the Trinity is invoked not just once; and in the litanies already accepted long ago in the Church there is this formula of praying (although Luther and Calvin, along with the Arians, reject it): *Holy Trinity, one God, have mercy on us.*

Furthermore, Dionysius in his book on Mystical Theology said: *Superessential Trinity, guide us.* And Nazianzen in Oration 2 on peace, near the end: *O holy and adorable and patient Trinity (for you are patient, who for so long tolerate those from whom you are separated), would that you would also accept them as your adorers.* And in his Oration for 150 Bishops: *Farewell, O Trinity, my meditation and my glory, I beg you to care for these, and you do care for them, etc.* Marius Victorious in the third hymn on the Trinit}' said: *Forgive our sins, grant us eternal life, give us peace and glory, O Blessed Trinity. Free us, save us and justify us, O blessed Trinity.* And Augustine said at the end of his treatise on the Trinity: *O Lord the one God, God the Trinity, whatever I have said in these books that is of Yours, may they acknowledge who are Yours; if anything of my own, may it be pardoned both by You and by those who are Yours. Amen.*

CHAPTER XVIII

THE FIFTH ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED

The fifth objection is: The Evangelists and Apostles constantly stress that the true Christ was born of the Virgin, suffered, died, and they did not know any other one before him; otherwise Matthew, Mark and Luke would not have begun their gospel from his nativity, but would have narrated other things done by Christ before the flesh, and John would not have said: *This was the first of his signs that Jesus did* (John 2:11), if he had been Christ from eternity. Moreover, in Acts 2:36 Peter says: *Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified.* But Christ the eternal God could not become Lord and Christ, because he always was that naturally; therefore, the true Christ was not from eternity, and so he cannot be the true God. The Transylvanians repeat this argument more than once in their work which we have already often cited.

We can add to the confirmation of this error (so that with our answer the truth may be more evident) the testimonies proposed by the ancient Arians. Therefore, they admit that the Christ existed before the Incarnation, but they prove this from the words in Prov. 8:22 according to the LXX: *The Lord created me at the beginning of his work.* And Sir. 24:8: *Then the Creator of all things gave me a commandment, and the one who created me assigned a place for my tent.* John 1:30: *After me comes a man who ranks before me, for he was before me.* Col. 1:15: *He is the first-born of all creation.* But the first-born is like his brothers in nature. Heb. 3:1-2: *Consider Jesus Christ, the apostle and high priest... who was faithful to him who made him.*

I respond to the argument of the Transylvanians that we also do not acknowledge another Christ than the one who was born, suffered and died; for there is one Christ, not several, and still we believe that that one was born twice according to his two natures.

To the claim that the Evangelists do not mention another Christ before the flesh, I say: the Evangelists took up the task to describe the coming of the Messiah, and his deeds, that is, the coming of the incarnate God, his life, doctrine, death, resurrection, etc., and therefore it was not necessary for them to begin on a higher level. Nevertheless lest we should think that the Word did not exist before the flesh, the Evangelist John begins in this way: *In the beginning was the Word, etc.* And in his first letter he begins: *That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, etc.* And in Rev. 1:8: *Who is and who was and who is to come.*

To the second quote from Acts 2:36 I respond with Cyril in book 9, chapter 3 of his Theses that Christ was made Lord by the Father because of his humanity, as also it could be said that he was made God, for he was made that through the Incarnation, so that the man Jesus may be God, and Lord, not by participation and grace, but through the union of the Word and the flesh. It could also be said, as Cyril notes in the same place, that the word "made" is used for "declared," as in Phil. 2:9: *He bestowed on him the name which is above every name.*

To the quote from Prov. 8:28, *The Lord created me,* the Fathers respond in many

ways. The first response is given by Athanasius in his book on the decrees of the Nicene Council from the Roman Dionysius, that the Greek word έκτισε in this place does not mean "to make," but "to preside over," so that the meaning is: *The Lord set me to preside over all his 'works to be created.*

The second response is that of Athanasius in sermon 3 against the Arians and in book 3, chapter 6 of Cyril's Thesis who say that the Scriptures indiscriminately use the words making, creating, generating. For, in Deut. 32:18 it is said: *You forgot the God who gate you birth.* And nevertheless we read in Gen. 1 and 2: *God made man.* Therefore not from the word alone "created" or "generated" is it necessary to get the meaning, but from the context or circumstances of Scripture. And because here it is said that the Son was created before God made anything else, it is obvious that the word "created" is used for "generated."

The third response is that of Athanasius in the same place, and Nazianzen in Oration 4 on Theology, and Cyril in book 5, chapters 4-7 on his Theses, and Augustine in book 1, chapter 12 on the Trinity: they say that in that same chapter of Proverbs it is written, *Before the hills I was brought forth,* and therefore that here both natures of Christ are explained—the divine nature when it is said "I was brought forth," and the human nature when it is said "he created me."

The fourth response is that of Basil in book 2 on Eunomius, of Epiphanius in heresies 69 which is about Arians, and of Jerome in his letter to Cyprian: they say that one must consult the Hebrew source, since in Hebrew the word is not "he created," which they express with mn but "get" nap with which word true generation is usually expressed, as in Gen. 4:1, *I have gotten a man with the help of the Lord;* Eve said this when she bore Cain 'mp nurx mnl and in this way here we have ^αρ, that is, *gotten by generation,* and thus also perhaps the LXX translates it, but the codex is distorted with the change of one letter, because έκτισε means "created," while έκτησε means "get" or "possess."

The fifth response is beautiful, and serves also for the following quote from Sir. 24:8, where it cannot be denied that the author wrote "he created." For this is the explanation of a certain oriental Catholic Council in canon 5, as is found in Hilary in his book on the Synods shortly after the beginning, and St. Thomas follows the same opinion in book 4, chapter 8 of his *Contra Gentiles.*

Therefore, we are saying that the production of the Son of God now is called generation, now is called creation, because it cannot be explained perfectly by any word. For, generation signifies a production in the same substance, but with a certain change in the one generating; creation signifies the production of another substance, but without change in the one creating. Next, the Son of God is produced in such a way that he receives the substance of the generator, and for that reason he can be said to be generated; but he receives it without the change or alteration of the producer, and for that reason he can be said to be created. Therefore, it is said in both ways, so that from both is taken what is perfect, and what is imperfect is omitted.

To the words from John 1:30, *a man who was made before me,* I say that what is meant by those words is not that Christ was produced before John, but that he is above John and preferred before him, as if John had said, *he who comes after me is greater than*

me. In this way Ambrose explains it in book 4, chapter 5 of his treatise on Faith, and all the interpreters, like Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, and it is also deduced from the text, for he says this: *He was made before me, because he was before me,* that is, *he preceded me in dignity, because he is eternal and I am temporal.*

To the expression, *the first-born of all creation,* Cyril in book 10, chapter 4 on the Theses says this: Christ is called the first-born as he is a man, just as he is said to be the first-born as he is God. He adds to this also that Christ could be said to be the first-born also since he is God, because he himself is the cause that others are made children of God; for, what is the cause of others is said to be first. But the Commentaries of Ambrose and Chiysostom seems to be more simple and more exact, since they teach that the Son is said to be the first-born of all creation because he was generated before any creature existed, which is clearly stated in Sir. 24:3: *I came forth from the mouth of the Most High, the first-born before every creature.* For if he came forth before every creature, then he himself is not a creature.

Then there is this in Heb. 1:4: *Having become as much superior to the angels, etc.* Chrysostom and Theophylact explain this as meaning "having been declared," and rightly so; for, here he is talking about the state obtained after the resurrection, for Paul says this: *When he had made purification for sins, he sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to the angels as the glory of a Son is more excellent than the condition of a slave.* Also, according to Cyril in book 8, chapter 2 of his Theses the expression "having become superior" can mean "more honored" or "admired by many," as we say I hold a good man in higher regard than a rich man, an angel than a man, etc.

The response to the last quote is clear. For, Christ is not said simply to have been made in Heb. 3:2, but made a high priest, which surely is true, if it is understood, as it should be understood, to be about Christ as he was man, not as he was God.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SIXTH ARGUMENT IS ANSWERED

The last objection is this: *It is more blessed to give than to receive.* That is what the Lord says, according to Paul in Acts 20:35, and it can also be demonstrated by reason. For, to give is the quality of a rich and perfect person, while to receive is the mark of a need and imperfect person. But the Father gives, and the Son receives. For the Father gave power to the Son, Matt. 28:18: *All power has been given to me, etc.* He gave him life in John 5:26: *He has granted the Son also to have life in himself.* He gave him wisdom, in the same place: *The Father loves the Son, and shows him all that he himself is doing.* And in John 15:15: *All that I have heard from my Father I have made known to you.* Finally, everything he has is from the Father, Matt. 11:27: *All things have been delivered to me by my Father;* therefore the Father and the Son are not equal, and much less are they one God.

Now it is not this sufficient if someone responds by saying that the Father indeed gives everything to the Son, but he does it naturally and necessarily, not freely and gratuitously; for only then is it more blessed to give than to receive, when someone gives freely. For, also the one who gives naturally is more perfect than the one who receives, as is clear from the relation between form and matter, between heaven and earth, and in similar cases. And the Arians added this: everything the Son has, he has from the Father, but he does not have absolutely everything that the Father has. For, in Matt. 20:23 the Son says: *To sit at my right hand and at my left is not mine to grant, but it is for those for whom it has been prepared by my Father.*

I respond that only then is it more blessed to give than to receive, when the one who receives is in potency to receive, and therefore he is needy and imperfect. But the Son of God received life in such a way that he never was in a state of non-living; he received power and wisdom in such a way that he never was weak or ignorant. For, he received all these things at his birth, but he was born from all eternity, and he was born perfect. Augustine in book 2, chapter 24 of his treatise against Maximinus said: *It is more blessed to give than to receive, but in this life where there is need, in which of course abundance is better.* Consult Augustine and Chrysostom for their comments on John 5, where they explain that the Father communicates to the Son not by teaching but by generating, and that the Son hears from the Father not by learning, but by being born. However, the Father is said to demonstrate, and the Son to hear, because the Father by communicating his essence thereby communicates knowledge.

To confirm that point from Matt. 20:23, I say with Jerome, Chrysostom and Cyril in book 10, chapter 5 on his Theses that Christ wanted to say: It is not in my power, and I am just and wise, to give you the first seats, because you are my friends and followers, but they go to those who have merited them; for to such the Father has destined them from eternity, and he did not destine them without the Word and the Holy Spirit.

But, you will say, they did merit them, for the Lord said: *Are you able to drink the cup, etc.* They said to him: *we are able.* And he said to them: *You will drink my cup, but to sit on my right hand, etc.* I respond: by drinking the cup they merited the kingdom, but not because of that the first seats. For, it is clear from John 16:15 that absolutely everything is common to the Father and the Son: *All that the Father has is mine.* And in John 17:10: *All thine are mine*

CHAPTER XX

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE DIVINITY OF THE HOLY SPIRIT ARE ANSWERED

The Transylvanians in book 2, chapter 5 bring almost nothing more against the divinity of the Holy Spirit than that in Scripture he is never called God, or Lord; this argument was made also by ancient Arians, according to Gregory Nazianzen in book 5 on Theology. But it is easy to respond to this: for it is also false that he is not called God, since in Acts 5:3 if. we read: *Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit?... You have not lied to men but to God.* And in 1 Cor. 6:19: *Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit.* And immediately after that: *So glorify God in your body.* And also, although the name "God" in the Scripture is not had, should it not be enough, if it is shown clearly in the Scriptures, from the works proper to God alone, that the Holy Spirit is God? What about the fact that the Scriptures nowhere say that the Holy Spirit is a creature, but still the adversaries impudently call the Holy Spirit a creature?

The old Arians raised objections from certain texts of Scripture, which however were easily explained by the holy Fathers. First, they raise an objection from Amos 4:13: *He who forms the mountains, and creates the wind (spiritum).* But Basil responds in book 3 on Eunomius that the wind in that place is called spirit, not the Holy Spirit, as also in Ps. 148 he says "stormy wind." All the commentators on this prophet explain it in the same way, like Jerome, Theodoretus and Rupert.

Second, they object to this in Rom 8:26: *The Spirit himself intercedes for us with sighs too deep for words.* Augustine responds in book 1 against Maximinus, number 13, with these words: *Understand this,* he said, *and you will avoid blasphemous speech. For thus it was said: He intercedes with sighs, to make us understand that he makes us intercede with sighs. Finally, in one place, the Apostle says he is crying "Abba, Father"; in another place he says, In whom we cry "Abba, Father," he explains what it means to cry "Abba Father," by saying, "In whom we cry": and therefore, what is "crying," except to make someone cry.* That is what he says. Chrysostom also in homily 14 on the letter to the Romans wants it to be understood that, by crying through the Holy Spirit, he is teaching the gift of prayer, by which the soul cries out and groans.

Third, they object to this in Joel 2:28: *I will pour out my Spirit.* John 15:26: *But when the Spirit comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father, etc.* For, as Augustine says in book 2, chapter 5 on the Trinity, the Arians taught that he who is sent is less than the one from whom he is sent; and since they read that the Son was sent by the Father, but the Holy Spirit by the Father and the Son, from this they concluded that the Son is less than the Father, and so is the Holy Spirit.

But Augustine responded that a mission by way of a command signifies the excellence of the sender, but this does not apply to every mission. He also said that the Son and the Holy Spirit are not sent by a command, but only are said to be sent, because the Son proceeds from the Father, and the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son, and that both the Son and the Holy Spirit began in time, in a new way that is both manifest and visible, to be among creatures. For, the Son appeared in the flesh, but the Holy Spirit in the form

of a dove, and again elsewhere in tongues of fire.

Therefore, that visible manifestation of an invisible person proceeding from another, in the Scriptures is called a "mission." But this mission in no way is opposed to the true divinity of the Son, or of the Holy Spirit; St. Augustine deduces this from the fact that both were sent to that place where they were previously in their invisible majesty. For, about the Son it is said in John 1:10: *He was in the world.., and the world knew him not;* and afterwards: *He came to his own home, etc.;* and about the Holy Spirit in Ps. 139:7: *Whither shall I go from thy Spirit?*

Fourth, they object to this in John 1:3: *All things were made through him.* Chrysostom responds in homily 4 on John that the Evangelist immediately added: *And without him was not anything made that was made,* so that the objection of the Arians might be excluded, and that we may understand that not absolutely everything that is, was made by the Word, but only everything that was made. But Cyril and Augustine read: *And without him nothing was made. That which was made was life in him;* for otherwise it would be necessary that the Father was made by the Word, if everything that is, was made by the Word.

Their last objection is a petty reason of small account. There are two ways of acting—by nature and by art. For, by nature sons are generated, by art things are made. But only the Word was produced by God by way of nature, since he is the only-begotten Son; therefore the Holy Spirit proceeds by art and therefore is an artifact.

We respond that the way of acting by nature is twofold in those things which are endowed with a mind and intelligence—one by intellect and the other by will. For, the intellect naturally produces ideas, and the will naturally produces acts of love. However, there is this difference between God and creatures, namely, that He by thinking and willing produces substance, but creatures produce accidents. From this it follows that the Word and the Holy Spirit are true hypostases; but the concepts of our mind, and the love of our will cannot be said to be hypostases. But about these matters we will say more in the following book, if the Lord deigns to give his assistance.

BOOK TWO

On the personal distinction from the Father and the Holy Spirit, and on the procession of the Holy Spirit.

CHAPTER I

ON THE DISTINCTION OF THE PERSONS IN THE SAME ESSENCE

Up to this point we have shown that the one true God is not only the Father, but also but also the Son and the Holy Spirit. Now it is necessary to show that these three—Father, Son and Holy Spirit—are truly three supposits and distinct, but not just three names or three beings of reason *(entia rationis)*. This question must be handled because of the same adversaries, namely, the new Arians and the new Samosatenians.

For, Valentinus Gentilis and his followers, although they confess with Arius that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are really three distinct things, nevertheless they do not acknowledge in the true God an intrinsic distinction, so that the same essence is in three persons; and therefore they do not want the Father to be called the first person, in fact they say that the first person is sophistic, and what is more horrible, diabolic, as is clear from the history of Benedict Aretius concerning the punishment of Valentinus Gentilis, and therefore they also ridicule the words—Essence, Person, Relation, Property, etc.

Now the Transylvanians acknowledge the Father as distinct from Christ, because they say Christ is a mere man; nevertheless, before the Incarnation they acknowledge no distinction in God, as is clear from book 2, chapter 4, where they say that the Word and Holy Spirit, who are mentioned in the Scriptures of the Old Testament, are potencies or powers of the Father, not distinct from his person by relation or by property. Hence also they enjoy ridiculing all those words or names.

First of all, therefore, we will consider these words and show that they are derived from Scripture and from the ancient Fathers. Secondly, we will prove that there truly are three distinct persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, although they are one God, as we showed in the previous book. Thirdly, we will solve the principal difficulties concerning this ineffable mystery, by which we believe and teach that there is only one God in three really distinct persons. Fourthly, we will argue in particular concerning the distinction of the Son from the Father, because of those who say the Son is αὐτόθεον (the self-God). Fifthly, we will treat the distinction of the same Son from the Holy Spirit, or what is the same thing, the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son.

CHAPTER II

ON THE WORDS WHICH WE USE IN EXPLAINING THIS MYSTERY

Regarding this first point, the words are these: Essence, Homousion, Hypostasis, Substance, Person, Property, Relation, Notion, Circuminsession, Trinity: concerning these words two things should be said. First, the things in general that are reproved by the Transylvanians in book 3, chapter 9 must be refuted. Then it will be necessary to explain each word in an orderly way. Therefore they say that, although these words are profane, still they should be retained by us for five reasons. First, because they are useful for opposing heretics. Second, because the Fathers used them. Third, not that we may say something, but so that we do not remain silent. Fourth, because they are useful for explaining the mysteries of Scripture. Fifth, because, although they do not occur in the Scriptures, still their seeds and equivalences are found there. Then they refute all these reasons which they proposed to themselves.

They respond to the first point that evil should not be done to accomplish something good; and also that the heretics, who are not convinced by the Scriptures, can be even less convinced by these words. But they do not correctly explain the Catholic teaching, for Catholics do not say that heretics are opposed by those words, but they are condemned and excluded from the Church. For, because of the new heresies, we are forced to find new words, so that we may be clearly distinguished from them, and Catholics may know what they should believe. On this point consult Augustine in Tractate 97 on John, where he shows that the profane novelties of names must be avoided, but not the new words, which are directed against the new heresies.

They respond to the second point; therefore all the errors of the Fathers will have to be accepted. But we deny this consequence. For the Fathers never err all together on the same matter, even though some of them at times do err. But we follow them when they teach something together, not when they defend their own singular opinions and others disagree with them. An example would be St. Cyprian, whom we do not follow when he says that Baptism conferred by heretics is invalid. For we know that in this matter the other doctors do not agree with Cyprian; and still we follow Cyprian when he teaches that Christ is true God, because all the doctors teach the same thing with complete agreement.

They respond to the third point that it is stupid to speak in order to say nothing. But they have not understood the words of Augustine in book 4, chapter 9 of his work on the Trinity, where he says: three persons are said to be in God, not so that it may be said, but so that it may not be kept silent. For, Augustine wanted to say that no word is sufficient to explain what those three are; nevertheless they are called persons, not so that we declare perfectly the power and nature of the divine persons, but so that we may not seem to be absolutely speechless when we are asked, what are those three?

To the fourth point they respond that those words are exotic and very obscure, and therefore they are useless for explaining the mysteries of the Faith. But soon we will prove that this is false, when we consider each of these words. Certainly those things cannot be said to be exotic, which for so many centuries were in the common use of the whole Catholic Church.

For the fifth point they deny that synonyms and equivalences are found in the Scriptures. But we will soon make it clear that this is a lie.

CHAPTER III

ON THE WORDS ESSENCE AND HOMOUSION

Therefore the first word is essence, in Greek οὐσία, which in the Scriptures is found in Luke 15:12, where the younger son asks his Father for the share of his inheritance, which in Greek is μέρος τῆς οὐσίας; here οὐσία means the possessions of the Father. But what is the possession of the Father, unless it is the divinity itself, which is the supreme and infinite good? However, because in this place the nature of God is not expressly called οὐσία, Epiphanius rightly could say in Heresies 73: *The word "essence" literally is not found in the Old and New Testaments, but the meaning and significance is found everywhere.* Those are his words. Therefore, although this word is not found in Scripture, still synonyms for it do exist. For in Rom. 1:20 it is said of God: *His eternal power and deity.* The Greek is θειότης, but what is θειότης but οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ? Likewise, in Phil. 2:6 there is μορφή τοῦ θεοῦ, the form of God. Certainly the word "form" is no less philosophical than "essence." And in 2 Pet. 1:4 we have the expression, *partakers of the divine nature,* which in Greek is θείας φύσεως. But essence and nature are absolutely the same.

Finally, the word "essence" is given in its root; for essence is derived from *esse* (to be) and is the abstract form of that word, which in the concrete is called *ens* (being). Further, "being" and "to be" in Scripture are said about God in Exod. 3:14: *I am who I am... Iam has sent me to you.* In Greek it is ὁ ὤν. Therefore, if God is called "being" according to the Scriptures, why can his nature not be called his essence?

To this point the Transylvanians respond absurdly. For, they say that God can be called "being," but not essence, because if someone called a man "humanity," he would be laughed at by all. But they do not realize that God is absolutely simple, and therefore both abstract and concrete words can be predicated of him. For, in Scripture he is called true God and truth, wise and wisdom, just and justice, so why can he not in the same way be called be called being and essence? But in this place we are not claiming that God can be called essence, but only that the word "essence," whereby the nature of God is explained, is not foreign to Scripture, and is not to be rejected as absurd. From this word comes the word ὁμοούσιος, that is, *of the same essence or substance;* the Arians, both old and new, have a special hatred for this word, both because it is not in the Scriptures, and because it seemed to them to be new. But they used words much more new, and which are not found in Scripture, such as ἑτερούσιος, that is, *of another essence,* and ὁμοιούσιος, that is, *of a similar essence.*

But the Fathers refute the first calumny in two ways. First, they prove that this word is not to be rejected because it is not in the Scriptures, since it is certain that the meaning of this word is found in the Scriptures, according to what the Lord says in John 10:30: *The father and I are one.* Augustine gives this response in Tractate 97 on John and in his dispute with Pascentius. Second, the Fathers tried to show that this word is not foreign to the Scriptures. And first of all Ambrose in book 3, chapter 7 of his work on Faith proves that this word is not foreign to Scripture, because Scripture

uses similar words. For, the Lord said in Luke 11:4 τόν άρτον ήμων τόν έπιούσιον. And Moses in Deut. 6, 14 and 26 calls the sons of Israel λαόν περιούσιον. But these words clearly are similar: έπιούσιος, περιούσιος, όμοιούσιος, as are also the Latin words, *supersubstantial* and *consubstantial.* Cyril in book 4 on the Trinity proves that Homoousion is not totally outside Scripture, since it is derived from ούσία, and ούσία is derived from όντος, and he cites this text in Exod. 3:14 *Iam,* ό ών.

Many Fathers openly refute the other calumny about the novelty of this word, and they show that this word was not invented at the Council of Nicaea as the Arians themselves formerly claimed, but that it was used by the Fathers before that Council. For, Dionysius of Alexandria in his Apology to the Roman Dionysius, as Athanasius reports in his letter on the thinking of Dionysius of Alexandria, says that he used this word, because although it is not found in Scripture, still it is in conformity with the things said in Scripture about the Father and the Son. And again the same Athanasius in his book on the decrees of Nicene Council says that the Arians undeservedly complain loudly about this word from the Roman and Alexandrian Dionysius. Likewise from Theognostus and Origen. And again in his book on the Synods of Ariminum and Seleucia he says that the Nicene Council did not state anything new, but used the words which the important Fathers had already used. Theodoretus also in book 1, chapters 12 and 13 of his History proves that this word is not new, and there is also the testimony of Eusebius of Caesarea who, although he favored the Arians, still did confess in a letter that the ancient and illustrious Fathers had used this word.

Ambrose in book 3, chapter 7 in his book on Faith writes that the Fathers at the Nicene Council took the occasion of using this word from the words of Eusebius of Nicomedia, the Arian heretic, who had written in a certain letter: *If we say that the true Son of God is uncreated,* we *are beginning to confess that he is homousion with the Father. When this letter was read,* said Ambrose, *at the Nicene Council, the Fathers put this word in the tractate on Faith, which they saw produced fear in their adversaries.* Notice, therefore, how shamelessly the Arians complained that this word was new, when they themselves previously had used it. Accordingly the lie of the Transylvanians is also refuted, who say in book 1, chapter 3 that at the Council of Nicaea a second God was introduced, co-essential with the Father, and therefore that he is a recent God, and unknown to the Fathers.

However here two things should be noted about this word. The first is, that this word was displeasing not only to the Arians, but also to some Catholics, which the Fathers at the Antioch Council had clearly refused to use against Paul of Samosata, namely that the Son is homousion (consubstantial) with the Father, and this took place before the birth of the heresy of Arius. First of all, Athanasius cited the authority of the two Dionysius, Roman and Alexandrian, who lived before that Council of Antioch and said that the Son is homousion with the Father. Then he reconciles all and says that the Antiochene Fathers denied that the Son is homousion with the Father according to the mind of Samosata, not simply. For, Samosata had accepted this word in a physical manner, as if it signified that the Son is consubstantial with the Father, just as one man is consubstantial with another man, so that they are two substances, but of the same

species. St. Hilary also speaks about this matter in his book on the Synods: *Samosata confessed homo usion in a bad sense, but did the Arians deny it in a better way? Formerly 80 Bishops rejected it, but recently 318 Bishops accepted it; the former disapproved of it against the heretic, Did not the latter approve of it against the heretic? If both by approving and by disapproving they established one thing for both, what can we conclude has been decided well?*

Secondly it should be noted that this word seems to have been divinely provided, since it destroys at the same time the contrary heresies of Arius and Sabellius. For, as Athanasius teaches in his book on the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia, and also Basil in a letter to the handmaids of God, homousion is not said about those things that in any way whatsoever have a similar essence, but about those only of which one is from another, and from him receives the same essence. Sabellius confesses that the Father and the Son have the same essence, but he denies that one is from the other. The Arians confess that the Son is from the Father, but they deny he received the same essence. Hence Athanasius in his book on the decrees of the Nicene Council says that the Arians tolerated other words besides that one, because all the others could be interpreted according to their meaning, and therefore that the Nicene Council in the Creed, after it had said that the Son is God from God, *true God from true God, begotten not made, born from the substance of the Father,* realized that all of that could be eluded by cleverness of the Arians, and therefore they added, *consubstantial* (homousion) *with the Father.* Epiphanius also in Ancorato warns that συνούσιον is one thing, and όμοουσιν is something else. For the first word could be accepted also by Sabellius, but not the second one. For, synousion signifies unity without distinction, but homousion signifies unity with distinction, and with the procession of one from another. Finally, Ambrose in book 3, chapter 7 on Faith said: *It is said rightly that the Son is homousion with the Father, because with that word both the distinction of persons, and the unity in nature is signified.* Those are his words.

This can be illustrated from the pre-predicaments of Aristotle, where he calls συνώνυμα what we say is *univocal,* and όνώμυνα what we say is *equivocal.* For just as a univocal word is absolutely one in both the word and the meaning, so the word "synousion" signifies something completely one without distinction, and as the equivocal word is just one word but it has many meanings, so homousion is one in essence, but distinct in persons.

CHAPTER IV

ON THE WORDS HYPOSTASIS AND SUBSTANCE

Hypostasis signifies the first substance, which in general we say is the suppositum, and in an intelligent being it means "person." However, it is distinguished from the essence, because this is signified by way of the total form existing in another. But hypostasis is signified by way of the whole thing, which does not exist in another, but it exists in itself and by itself. From this it follows that the hypostasis does not add to an essence a grade of nature or an act of some kind, but only a way of existing. Those things, said St. Thomas in I, q. 29, a. 2 and in De Pot. q. 9, a. 1, we say are subsisting, which exist not in another, but in themselves. From this again it follows that an essence is communicable, and a hypostasis is not communicable; for it is repugnant that what is in itself should be in another, because to be in another is not to be in oneself. From this finally it follows that the hypostasis is a certain property superadded to the essence, that is, something or a certain mode by reason of which it becomes incommunicable. All of these points are deduced from Basil in letter 43, from Nyssa in his book on the difference of essence and hypostasis, from Damascene in book 3, chapter 3, from Cyril in book 1 on the Trinity, from Justin in his book on the confession of the right Faith, and from Theodoretus in his short treatise against Sabellius, which is contained in volume II of the Councils, in the additions to the Breviary of St. Liberatus.

For although these Fathers do not seem to place a difference between essence and suppositum other than that which exists between a species and an individual, as between man and Peter; still the same Fathers openly profess (as we showed above in book 1, chapter 3) that God is one in number but not in species in such a way that the three divine hypostases cannot be said to be three divine individuals by reason of their nature, as if there were three individual deities, but only three by reason of the hypostatic property.

Therefore this word, although it seems suspect to some Fathers, as something that could be drawn to the signification of a substance, that is, of an essence, as is clear from Jerome in his two letter to Damasus on the hypostasis, from Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration in praise of Athanasius and from Mario Victor in his book on homousion, nevertheless it is to be received absolutely, and so it can be said safely that there are three hypostases in God.

It is proved first of all from the Apostle in Heb. 1:3, where it is said of the Son: *He reflects the glory of God and bears the very stamp of his nature;* in Greek it is, χαρακτήρ τής ὑποστάσεως αύτου, where by the word "hypostasis," although some understood it as essence, as Epiphanius seems to explain it in Heresies 69, nevertheless others understand it more correctly as the paternal person, like Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylact and Oecumenius in his Commentary on this text; and also Basil in letter 43 and Gregoiy of Nyssa in his book on the difference between essence and suppositum. For the Son is not the image of the essence, but of the person; for he is the image of him of whom he is the Son; for the image is distinguished from the exemplar, just like a thing produced is distinguished from its producer.

But Francis David in Disputation 2 Albana tries to show that Paul did not put a person in God; to prove this he cites other places in the same letter, where the word "hypostasis" is not used for person or for the suppositum. Heb. 3:14: *For we share in Christ, if only* ire *hold our first substance firm to the end.* In Greek for the word "substance" it reads, ὑποστάσεως. And Heb. 11:1: *Now faith is the substance of things hoped for.* In Greek it Ï5ύπόστασις.

I respond that these places support our thesis. For, in these texts the word "hypostasis" in general is used to signify the foundation or basis, which supports other things, and which subsists of itself. As in 2 Cor. 9 and 11 the same Apostle calls the foundation of glory ὑπόστασιν τής καυχήσεως. But here later this word is changed and accommodated to Faith, because Faith is the foundation of justification, and it not only exists by itself, but it also gives subsistence to the things hoped for, since the things we hope for are not in themselves, but through Faith in a certain way they seem to exist already. Hence also it is accommodated to the suppositum, or person, which is the foundation of nature, and of everything which is the result of nature: for everything exists in the person, and the person exists of itself *(per se).* Therefore when it is said, the Son is the image of the paternal hypostasis, the word "hypostasis" in that sentence cannot signify anything other than the person of the Father, which exists per se; and in that essence both all the attributes and also the relations subsist, and therefore it can be called the foundation and basis.

Secondly, it is proved from the use of the Church from the Fathers; for, Dionysius, in chapter 1 of his book on the divine names and elsewhere, calls the three persons three hypostases. Justin does the same thing in his work on the confession of the right Faith. Athanasius says the same concerning the Creed; all the Greek Fathers say the same thing, including the fifth Council in chapter 1. Likewise Hilary in his book on the Synods, and Augustine on the Trinity in book 5, chapters 8 and 9, and in book 9, chapter 4. Finally, Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration in praise of Athanasius, almost at the end, says that Athanasius demonstrated that the Greeks mean exactly the same thing, when they say that in God there are three hypostases, as what the Latins mean when they say there are three divine persons, and that without a good reason the Latins at times were offended by the expression of the Greeks, since there was no disagreement about the reality.

The Council of Sardis, as reported by Theodoretus in book 2, chapter 8 of his History, is not opposed to what we just said. There we read that it is heretical to say that there are three hypostases, while the Catholics say there is only one. For, the Council in the same place explains, when stating their statement, that there is only one hypostasis in God, if hypostasis is taken for the essence, as the heretics were wont to accept it. But it will be worth the effort here to quote the exact Greek words of the Council, so that no doubt may remain. Therefore, here is what it said: ήμεις ταύτην παρειλήφαμεν, και δεδιδάγμεθα και ταύτην έχομεν τήν καθολικήν παράδοσιν και πίστιν και ομολογίαν, μίαν είδε ύπόστασιν ήν αύτοι όι αιρετικοί ούσίαν προσαγορεύσυσι του πατρός και του ύιου και του άγιου πνέυματος.

The Transylvanians in book 1, chapter 8 raise an objection based on the authority of Nicephorus in book 10 of his History, who says the following about the words hypostasis

and ousia. In the first place, the first one to mention these words in disputes about God was Hosius of Cordova, whom Constantius had sent to Alexandria to quell the riots caused by Arius. Secondly, the Nicene Council did not want to deal with the question about difference between essence and subsistence. Thirdly, the Council of Alexandria, held a short time after Nicaea, decreed that those words about God should not be used, since the words "substance" and "subsistence" do not occur in Scripture. Fourthly, among the ancient philosophers the word "hypostasis" is not found, and it is barbarous. Fifthly, because of this distinction many attacks have been made against the Church; in a word, the Council reprehends the use of these words.

I respond that Nicephorus took what he says from Socrates in book 3, chapter 5, and from Sozomenus in book 5, chapter 1 1; these authors do not so much reprehend these words as they do about the new question concerning the distinction between them. Therefore, although Hosius perhaps was the first, who discussed this distinction, still he was not the first one to use these words, since they are found in Dionysius and Justin in places already cited, and the word "hypostasis" is found in St. Paul; and we have already shown that the word "homousion," which is derived for *ousia,* is very ancient. Moreover, the Nicene Council, although it did not resolve the question about the difference between essence and subsistence, still it did not totally avoid these words, as is clear from the Creed which is found in book 1 of Cyril's work on the Trinity and is given also in Greek in the Latin codices; for, in the Creed both words are used—οὐσίας and ὑποστάσεως. But that the Council of Alexandria did not forbid the use of these words absolutely, but only to avoid unnecessary conflicts, is clearly gathered from the fact that the same authors say that in the same Council it was decreed that Catholics may use these words in disputes against the Sabellians, lest because of a lack of words they might seem to agree with the Sabellians.

But what Socrates and Nicephorus add, namely, that the word ὑποστάσεως is barbarous and almost unknown to the philosophers, and that Nicephorus says that disputes about the distinction of these words is trivial, is not very important. For, it is clear from the Commentary of Budaeus that this very word was not unknown to the ancient philosophers; to prove this he cites Aristotle and Themistus, two outstanding philosophers, who often used the word ὑποστάσεως. And even if none of the philosophers ever had used the word, should it not be enough for us that Paul, the Council of Nicaea and all the Greek Fathers used it? But it is clear from Basil in letter 43 that the debates about οὐσία and ὑποστάσις are not trivial; for, he says because of ignorance of this distinction was born the error of several thinkers about the knowledge of God. Furthermore, if these matters were trivial, why did Justin, Cyril, Basil, Nyssa, Theodoretus, Damascene and so many others debate so seriously about them?

Actually, the word "substance" is ambiguous; for, at one time it signifies hypostasis and at another time essence; accordingly strictly three substances can be said to be in God, as Hilaiy concedes in his book on the Synods. There, while explaining the Faith of the Antioch Council, he says that the three substances are not said wrongly, by accepting substance not for οὐσία but for ὑποστάσις, especially since the Vulgate translation used this word in Heb. 1, 3 and 11; but three substances in God are to be denied absolutely,

and only one asserted, because the common use of the Latin Fathers uses the word "substance" for essence. For, Aristotle in the predicament of substance always calls it οὐσίαν, which we say is substance. Furthermore, Tertullian in his book against Praxeas always says there is one substance in God. Likewise Jerome in his letters to Damasus and Augustine in book 5, chapter 9 on the Trinity (also in book 7, chapter 4) and Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 29 of his History say there is one substance, and deny that there are three. Finally, the Lateran Council also under Innocent III in chapter 2 and Toledo II in chapter 1 define that there is one substance in God.

CHAPTER V

ON THE OTHER WORDS

On the word "Person," the opinion of Valla in book 6, chapter 34 is expressed brilliantly; he says that "person" signifies a quality. For, we say that someone acts like a king, etc., and he adds: if the word "person" is taken for the substance, then there is not in God a person greater than in a brute animal. And finally he says: what the theologians put in God as persons—they are three qualities.

But Valla acts badly in the person of a theologian; for, in God there is person, but in him there is no quality; or if it pleases to call in God by the name of quality, the things that are signified by way of quality, then there are not three, but infinite divine persons will have to be named, or only one will be established. If indeed those things which in some way can be said to be qualities in God are distinguished not in reality, but only logically: on this account, if the personal properties in God are qualities, there will be one divine person actually, but several logically. If that is what Valla thinks, then he is taking the person of Sabellius in an outstanding manner.

Therefore, although we know that the word "person" is often used for a quality, or for the mask of actors, nevertheless we also know that it is used for the first substance by the Scriptures and by the Fathers. For, in the Scriptures we read passim that God is not the respecter of persons, as in Acts 10:27 and Rom. 1:27 and elsewhere; in these places the word "person" signifies the human hypostasis. For, as Augustine explains in book 2, chapter 7 to Boniface, then there is an acceptance of persons in the distribution of rewards, when the one who distributes does not respect the merits of men, but the men themselves, that is, he gives more to one than to another, not because the one merits more, but because he loves the person more. Moreover, Tertullian calls the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit three persons in his book against Praxeas, Hilary in the book on the Synods, Jerome in his letters to Damasus, Augustine in book 5 and 7 on the Trinity, and among the Greeks Nazianzen in his Oration in praise of Athanasius, and elsewhere he often uses πρόσωπα.

And lest Valla rejoice because he has at least functioned in the person of a grammarian, M. Tullius Cicero also says in his book on Topics and Divisions that he often uses the word "person" in our meaning, since he says that the attributes of things are one thing, but the attributes of persons are something else, and he also says that person is to be considered in God and in man. Likewise Valerius Maximinus in book 2, chapter 21 calls all persons men. And in the Institutions Justinian, writing in Latin in book 2, title 9, uses the word "person" with this meaning. Then there is also the fact that the grammarians, when in the inflection of verbs distinguish three persons—first, second and third, by the name of "person" they do not understand a quality, but any kinds of things distinct among themselves.

Property, Relation, Notion are not words in the Scriptures, but they are deduced from the Scriptures, as an obvious consequence. For, if the Son is *only-begotten* (John 1:14), therefore it is proper to him to be the Son, and so filiation is a property. And if *the Father*

is the one God (1 Cor. 8:6), then it is proper to the Father to be Father, and paternity will be a property. And if *the Holy Spirit alone proceeds from the Father and the Son* (John 15:26), such procession will be his property. But the proper name is used only by Hilary in book 2 on the Trinity, Basil in letter 43, Nazianzen in Oration 3 on Theology, Augustine in book 5, chapters 11 and 12 on the Trinity, Cyril in book 1 on the Trinity.

Likewise, if Christ is the true Son of the true Father (1 John 5:11), certainly there will be a true relation between the Father and the Son; for it cannot be imagined how he could be a true Son who does not have a real relation to his Father. But the same Fathers use this word, especially Nazianzen and Augustine.

Finally, if according to the Scriptures the Father is distinguished from the Son, why cannot paternity be said to be the notion of the Father, that is, the name by which the distinct Father is known by the other persons? But Basil in letter 43 and Augustine in book 5, chapter 6 on the Trinity do use this name, and from that the scholastics concluded that there are five notions—Innascibility, Paternity, Filiation, active Spiration and passive Spiration; of these only four are said to be properties, namely, Innascibility, Paternity, Filiation, passive Spiration. Also there are four relations—Paternity, Filiation, active Spiration and passive Spiration. This is not the place to consider these ideas at great length.

Circuminsession, in Greek περιχώρησις, is the name for the intimate and perfect indwelling of one person in another, and conversely, concerning which it is said in John 14:10: *Iam in the Father, and the Father is in me.* This singular mystery is discussed by Hilary in book 4 on the Trinity, Ambrose on 2 Cor. 13, and Augustine in the last chapter of book 6 on the Trinity, where he concludes with these words: *Each are in each, and all in each, and each in all, and all in all, and all are one. Let him who sees this, whether in part, or through a glass and in an enigma, rejoice in knowing God; and let him honor Him as God, and give thanks; but let him who does not see it, strive to see it through piety, not to cavil at it through blindness* (as the Transylvanians do now). *Since God is one, but yet is a Trinity; and this is not to be accepted in a confused manner. From whom are all things, and through whom are all, and in whom are all; not to many Gods, but to him only be glory for ever and ever.* But Damascene uses the word περιχώρησις in book 1, chapter 11, and because of that the Scholastics usually called it "Circuminsession."

The word "Trinity," in Greek Τριάς, also is not found explicitly in the Scriptures. However, it is evidently deduced from Matt. 28:19: *Baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* And 1 John 5:8 [Vulgate] *There are three who give witness in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit.* And all the Fathers use this name, even the earliest ones, like Dionysius in chapter 1 on the divine names, and often elsewhere. The same holds for Justin on the right confession of the Faith, Gregory Thaumaturgus in his confession of Faith, Tertullian in his book against Praxeas, Cyprian in his sermon on the Lord's Prayer, and all the later Fathers.

However, it is to be observed that "Trinity" does not signify the unity of three, as Valentinus Gentilis thought, but simply a threeness of persons, as is clear both from the Greek word Τριάς, and from the sentence in the Athanasian Creed: *We worship the Trinity in unity.* For, how absurd would it be if we were to say: *We worship the Unity of*

Three in Unity? Then if the word "Trinity" signified expressly "Unity," how would those Fathers not have to be reprehended, who oppose Unity to Trinity, and say that Unity is to be considered in the essence, and Trinity in the persons, and likewise that number is perceived in the Trinity, but that in the essence what is to be numbered is not found? Fulgentius in chapter 1 of his letter on Faith to Peter said: *Trinity refers to the persons, Unity to the nature.* The Council of Toledo XI in chapter 1: *In the relations of the persons number is perceived; but in the substance of the divinity what is to be numbered is not comprehended.* Isidore explains this same point at length in book 7, chapter 4 of his Etymology. But St. Thomas treats the matter in I, q. 31, a. 1; although he says the word seems to be used as if there were the unity of three, if one considers only the root of the word; however, in the same place he says that this is not what is really meant by the word, since it refers only to the number of three persons.

It is also to be observed that Genebrardus in book 2 on the Trinity did not correctly quote Calvin when he said that he did not include the essence in the persons. For, as is evident from the book concerning the perfidy of Valentinus Gentilis, who was executed in Geneva, and also from the very passage which he quoted, that is, book 1, chapter 13 § 25 of the Institutes, Valentinus had said that the Trinity is the unity of three, and he declared that those three are the Essence, the Son and the Holy Spirit; with these words he put the essence in the place of the first person, and numbered it with the other two: Here are the words of Gentilis: *Three,* he said, *come together in the Trinity, the Essence, which is called the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. And this is the true Trinity, which is a Unity of three, not four, no matter what Lord Calvin says about the etymology.* But Calvin in refuting this madness says that the essence is not included in the Trinity, as if one is from the number three, but it is included in all three, which of course is very true; and would that Calvin always erred in this way. But we said this not to defend Calvin, whom in our writings we are accustomed to oppose, but so that Gentilis might not seem to be excused, who truly and alone erred, but Genebrardus, a pious Catholic, was not aware of it, because perhaps he had not read the book by Gentilis.

CHAPTER VI

THE DISTINCTION OF PERSONS IS SHOWN

Regarding the second point, it must be proved that in God, who is one and simple, there really is found three distinct things, which we call persons or hypostases. In this real distinction of three all those things are founded, concerning which we have already spoken, that is, the persons, properties, relations, etc. Peter Lombard in book 1, distinction 2 and many others present as an argument, that Scripture joins together the plural name of God with a singular verb, as in Gen. 1:1 : *In the beginning God created* KI3; and in Ps. 37:13: *The Lord shall laugh at him* pmr ΄HK. But I do not think this argument is very solid, since the custom of Scripture seems to be that the names of illustrious persons are put in the plural number, even though the verbs remain in the singular. We Italians in part imitate this custom, since to adult men we do not say *you* (in the singular), but *thou* (in the plural), although we are addressing one person and not many.

Now lest what I am saying may seem to reflect a certain Rabbinism, from which I want to be very far removed, I will offer some reasons for my position. Therefore I am moved by these reasons. First, because I see that this same thing occurs in Scripture, when it is speaking about men or false gods, as in Exod. 20:3: *You shall have no other gods before me;* in Hebrew it reads: *There shall not be other gods before me* □"Tibx η|? mnl là οηπκ. Gen. 24:9: *So the servant put his hand under the thigh of Abraham:* in Hebrew it is WK, *of his Lords.* In Exod. 21:4: *If his master gives him a wife;* in Hebrew it is, *If his lords give* ΄THK DK, but certainly if something mysterious is hidden here, plural nouns with singular verbs would not be joined together passim in this way. Second, if these words had a plural meaning, it would be permitted to say, there are several true Gods. For who could complain, if we followed Scripture in this way. For I ask why it is permitted in Hebrew to call the divine persons Gods, and it is not permitted to do the same in Latin?

You will say: Scripture does not put the name of God in the plural, unless it is joined to a singular verb. I respond: that is not true. For in 2 Sam 7:23 where we read: *What other nation on earth is like the people Israel, whom God went to redeem, etc.* In Hebrew we read: D'nbK ΄lΛII *Gods went.* And elsewhere you will find many similar examples. Therefore this is what I ask: why is it permitted in Hebrew to say "Gods went" about the divine persons, and it is not permitted in Latin? Certainly there is no other reason except because of the custom of the Hebrews that a plural name can signify a single thing; but those speaking Latin do not have this custom.

Third, because the Septuagint does not, nor does Jerome ever translate it as *Gods,* nor does anyone else dare to give such a translation. This is an argument that those names do not have a plural meaning in those texts, but do have a singular meaning.

Fourth, if the name of God in the Hebrew text had a plural meaning wherever it is found in the plural number, there would be a clear and frequent contradiction in the words of divine Scripture. Since we often read that there is only one God, and still frequently we read *Gods.* However, it is not credible that God wanted to disturb his people with these apparent contradictions, and to offer the adversaries an occasion for blaspheming.

Therefore, having omitted what was just said, the first argument, and indeed a demonstrative one, is this. He who receives his being from another, necessarily is distinguished from him really, and also it cannot happen that someone is produced from himself; but the Son receives his being from the Father, and the Holy Spirit from both of them; therefore these three, since they are distinct, are three subsistences, and therefore three hypostases or persons.

The assumption of the first argument is to be proved from the Scriptures; for the others are per se evident. And that the Son has his being from the Father is proved first of all from Prov. 8:22: *The Lord possessed me,* that is, *obtained me by generation:* for that is what the Hebrew word 'Hp signifies. And lest they say that this is to be understood to be about Christ the man in predestination, or generated in a foreseeing before the hills, it is said: *When he established the heavens I was there.*

For someone who had his being only in predestination could not create the world with the Father; for, what has being only in predestination, does not exist, but is something future. But what does not exist, cannot operate; therefore, the Son of God, who with the Father made all things, already existed at the beginning of the world, but he had received his being through generation from the Father.

Moreover, it is said in Sir. 24:5: *Alone I have made the circuit of the vault of heaven.* Likewise in John 5:26: *He has granted the Son also to have life in himself* There we are taught that life was given to the Son by the Father, not as creatures have life, but as the Father himself has it. Likewise in Col. 1:15 the Son is called *the image, the first-born of God:* but both names include necessarily distinction and procession. And it cannot be understood to be about Christ the man, for there it is said to be about the first-born: In him and through him all things were made. Similarly in Heb. 1:3 the Son is said to reflect the glory of God and to be the very stamp of his nature, and all of these things signify a procession. And lest these things be applied to the humanity, in the same place the words are added: *He upholds the universe by his word of power.*

Finally, in 1 John 5:20 we read: *And we are in him, who is true, in his Son.* Certainly the true Son from the Father is truly born; and lest this be applied only to the man Christ, he adds: *This is the true God, and eternal life.* Therefore the matter is certain to be about the Son—that he is from the Father, and therefore really is distinguished from the Father. This will be proved later about the Holy Spirit when he will be treated explicitly. In the meantime what is said in John 15:26 will suffice: *But when the Counselor comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, who proceeds from the Father.* For here it is said explicitly, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and therefore he is distinguished from him. He is also said to be sent by the Son, and therefore he is also distinguished from him; for a mission in God cannot be understood, unless it is according to a procession, as was said above, and will be said again below.

The second argument is taken from the word "another," since Scripture calls the Father "another" one in reference to the Son, and the Holy Spirit as "another" in reference to both of them. This indicates a clear and real distinction. Thus in John 5:32 the Son, when speaking about the Father, says: *There is another who bears witness to me.* And in John 14:16 he says about the Holy Spirit: *The Father will give you another Counselor.*

But we would not say about one person, Mark is another, Tullius is another, Cicero is another; nor would we say about the same person, another is an orator, another a consul, another an emperor. But it is to be observed with St. Fulgentius, in his book on the objections of the Arians, that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are said to be another, and another, and another, but not something, and something, and something; the reason is that "something" signifies a distinction in the essence, while "another" signifies a distinction between persons. Therefore, in John 10:30 Christ says: *I and the Father are one,* not, *we are something.*

The third argument is taken from certain words denoting a distinction, like *Among, With, In, And,* for example as in Prov. 8:27: *When he established the heavens I was with him.* John 1:1: *And the Word was with God.* And in the same place: *The only begotten Son in the bosom of the Father.* John 14:10: *I am in the Father, and the Father is in me.* Matt. 28:19: *Baptize all in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* Isa. 48:16: *And now the Lord God has sent me and his Spirit.* And Eph. 2:18: *For through him we both have access in one Spirit to the Father.* For, if Father, Son and Holy Spirit were only names, and not realities, they would be completely synonymous, as in the case with M.T. Cicero. But who would say that Mark was with Tullius, or near Tullius, or in Tullius? Or that Mark and Tullius did this? Or that through Mark we have access to Tullius in Cicero?

They will say that the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit are not only names, but that the Father is true God. And they say that the Word and the Holy Spirit are powers or attributes of God the Father, but that they are distinct from him logically, not really. But propositions of that kind cannot truly be said about powers or attributes. For, who would say: wisdom is with the intellect? Or, wisdom did this with the intellect? Or, the man and his hand did this? Therefore, it must be admitted either that Scripture is speaking ineptly, or that there is a true distinction between Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The fourth argument is taken from the fact that Scripture introduces God speaking in the plural number, or speaking about God as if he were another person. Thus in Gen. 1:26: *Then God said, let us make man in our image.* Gen. 3:22: *Behold, the man has become like one of us.* Gen. 11:7: *Come, let us go down, and there confuse their language.* Gen. 19:24: *The Lord rained... from the Lord.* Hos. 1:7: *And the Lord said... I will deliver them by the Lord their God.* Zech. 3:2: *The Lord said to Satan, the Lord rebuke you, O Satan!* And although the Rabbis elude all of this, saying that they are expression of the language, etc., and it is difficult to convince them; nevertheless, among Catholics they have their own authority, because the Fathers passim use these arguments. And the Council of Syrmiense, quoted by Hilary in his book on the Synods, imposed an anathema on those who give a different explanation of the texts found in Genesis. Furthermore, we have some other texts in the New Testament, which can in no way be evaded. Thus there is John 10:30: *I and the Father are one.* And John 14:23: *And we will come to him and make our home with him.* For, one and the same person, who has many names or offices, cannot truly say by reason of those names or offices, *we will make,* or *we will come.* Since it is the function of persons to make and to come, not of names or offices, so who would not laugh if he were to read that Cicero said: Tullius and I will come?

The fifth argument is taken from the fact that Scripture, when speaking about God, often uses the ternary number. Thus in Exod. 3:14: *I am who I am... I am has sent me to you.* And in the same place: *The God of your Fathers appeared to me, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.* Num. 6:23-26: *Thus you shall bless the people of Israel: The Lord bless you and keep you; The Lord make his fact to shine upon you, and be gracious to you. The Lord lift up his countenance upon you, and give you peace.* Deut. 6:4: *The Lord our God is one God.* Ps. 67:6-7: *God our God has blessed us. God has blessed us; let all the ends of the earth fear him.* Ps. 136:1-3: *O give thanks to the Lord, for he is good, for his steadfast love endures for ever. O give thanks to the God of gods, for his steadfast love endures for ever.* And Isa. 6:3: *Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God.*

Here it should be noted with Theodoretus, in book 2 for the Greeks, that God in the Old Testament did not want to propose the mystery of the Trinity expressly, because the Jews were not capable of accepting it, and because they had just left Egypt, where many gods were worshipped, and were about to enter into the land of Canaan, where there were also many gods; this was so that they should not think that three gods were being proposed to them for worship. Rather, God wanted to foreshadow this mysteiy, and he did it in many ways, so that when it would be preached in the New Testament, it might not seem to be completely new, or opposed to the Old Testament.

The sixth argument is from the numbers expressed in twos and threes in Scripture. Thus in John 8:17-18: *In your law it is written that the testimony of two men is true; I bear witness to myself, and the Father who sent me bears witness to me;* there clearly he makes himself and the Father the two witnesses. And in John 15:26 concerning the Holy Spirit he adds: *He will bear witness to me,* so in this way there are three. And in 1 John 5:8 [Vulgate]: *There are three witnesses in heaven, the Father, the Word and the Holy Spirit.*

Finally, the natural harmonies can be added, which do not prove the Faith, but, once it has been accepted, they show that what we are saying is not against reason. I will not speak about these harmonies at length, but I will be content merely to point them out, lest we seem to place the foundation of our Faith on such natural reasons.

Therefore, the first reason is this. It is the nature of the supreme and infinite good to communicate himself supremely and infinitely. However, God did not communicate himself in a supreme and infinite way in the production of creatures. The second reason. Perfect beatitude comprehends every good thing; the one, and indeed the outstanding good, is the association of equal persons. The third reason. To generate someone similar to oneself is a perfection, which should not be lacking in God, who is perfect in every way. The fourth reason. It is better that God produced something from eternity, than that he remained idle. The fifth reason. Because one nature is found in one hypostasis, as in each angel; and several in several, as in many angels; several in one, as in man, where two natures, soul and flesh, one spiritual, the other corporal are present in the one human hypostasis, therefore it is credible that there is also one nature, that is, the divine in several hypostases, that is, in the Father, in the Son and in the Holy Spirit. The sixth reason. A reason is found in the traces which God has imparted in a certain way to

creatures; St. Augustine examines these traces in books 9 to 15 in his book on the Trinity.

Therefore, all things so reflect the number three, that clearly all of them seem to cry out that their author is a Trinity, who made all things with weight, number and measure. First of all, therefore, there are the three transcendentals common to all things—one, true and good. Then the whole universe is distributed into three parts: for whatever exists either is spiritual, or corporal, or a mixture of both. Spiritual things are divided into three hierarchies: each hierarchy has three orders; but the individual spiritual angels reflect not just a trace, but an image of the Trinity, since they are endowed with three faculties—memory, intellect and will. And in them from the mind is born an idea, and love proceeds from the idea. Then in corporeal things almost innumerable traces of the Trinity are found; but to point them out would take too much time, and it seems that it is unnecessary to do that here. Now we will proceed to refute the arguments of the adversaries.

CHAPTER VII

THE FIRST ARGUMENT AGAINST THE DISTINCTION OF PERSONS IN THE SAME ESSENCE IS REFUTED

The first argument is that of Valentinus Gentilis. He who does not generate, noris generated, nor proceeds, is not the true God. But one God in essence does not generate, nor is generated, nor proceeds. Therefore, the one God in essence is not the true God. But Father, Son and Holy Spirit are, according to you, the true God. Therefore they are not one God in essence. The proposition of the first syllogism is proved in this way: There is no God besides the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. But the Father generates, the Son is generated, and the Holy Spirit proceeds. Therefore one who does not generate, nor is generated, nor proceeds, is not the true God. The assumption of the same first syllogism is proved in this way: God in essence is nothing other than the essence itself common to the three; but the Scholastics teach that the essence does not generate, noris it generated, nor does it proceed.

To this argument John Wigandus in his book against the new Arians was not able to respond, except by denying that the essence does not generate and is not generated, in spite of what the Scholastics say. Then he offers the following argument, which he thinks is a demonstration. The Son of God, according to the Scriptures, was generated; and the Son of God is a certain living essence, not a fiction according to the Scriptures. Therefore the essence according to the Scriptures is generated, and therefore also generates. By the proposal of this argument he seems to have refuted the Scholastics with one blow.

Wigandus does not really solve the argument, but he falls into a serious error. For, if the essence generates and is generated, then there are two essences, for it cannot be understood that one and the same thing is produced from itself. And lest he say that this is not according to the Scriptures, let him think that we prove from the Scriptures that the Father and the Son are really distinct in no other way than that one is produced from the other.

Rightly, therefore, did Lateran Council IV define in chapter 2 that the essence does not generate nor is generated. And the argument of Wigandus does not conclude anything, rather it suffers from the fallacy of an accident. For, although the Son includes the essence, still he is distinguished logically from it by reason of the relation, which he says beside the essence; and inasmuch as he is distinguished from it, it is suitable for him to be generated, which is not suitable for the essence. Just as the Father includes the same essence, but is distinguished from it logically because of the relation of paternity, which he has beside the essence, so the Father is said to generate, but the essence is not said to do that. There would be a similar fallacy if someone should say: Man is a species; Peter is a man; therefore Peter is a species. Or, Peter is an individual; and Peter is aman; therefore man is an individual.

Regarding the principal argument, the proposition can be distinguished. For, when it is said—the one who does not generate, nor is generated, nor proceeds, is not the true God, if the word "God" is taken for a divine person in general, the proposition is true.

For, one who does not generate, nor is generated, nor proceeds, is not a divine person; but if the essence itself is understood in the assumption by one God in the essence, the assumption is also true. But from that one can only conclude that the essence is not a divine person formally, but it cannot be concluded that the essence is not the true God.

However, if one God is accepted in the assumption, as the words indicate, that is, for persons in general, then the assumption is false. For, it is true to say, one God in essence generates, is generated, and proceeds. For that one God is the Father who generates, it is the Son who is generated, and it is the Holy Spirit who proceeds. But if the word "God" in the proposition is taken for the Deity, as it can be taken, because in God the person is not distinguished from the nature, then the proposition is false, as is clear, and the proof does not conclude. For the essence is not God, besides the three persons; however it does not generate, nor is it generated, nor does it proceed, because it is distinguished logically from the persons, to whom it really belongs to generate, to be generated and to proceed.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SECOND ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

Here is the second argument of the Transylvanians in book 1, chapter 5. If three persons are one in essence, there will be a quaternary in God, not a Trinity; for, Essence, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are four names, and they are not synonyms. Therefore they signify four things. Likewise, Father, Son and Holy Spirit are three; but the Essence is not one of these, for the Essence is not the Father, because it does not generate, nor is it the Son, because it is not generated, nor is it the Spirit, because it does not proceed; therefore it is some fourth thing.

Moreover, the essence is the fount of the persons, for the relations flow from it, and therefore the persons, which are constituted by the relations. But a fount and the stream from it are distinguished really; therefore the essence is distinguished really from the three persons; therefore with them it makes a number of four.

Moreover, the Papists in the Creed, after the words, *I believe in one God,* place a comma, lest they be forced to say, *I believe in one God the Father;* therefore they distinguish God from the Father; but further on they also distinguish the Father from the Son, and the Son from the Holy Spirit; therefore there are four.

Moreover, the Papists say that there are three persons in one God, and that the one God manifests himself in three persons: but who is that God? Certainly it is not the Father, nor the Son, nor the Spirit, for none of these manifested himself in three persons, and the three persons do not reside in any of these three; therefore there is a fourth God.

I respond that no quaternary is located in God; rather, I say that there is an anathema on those who worship a quaternary in place of the Trinity. And the argument proposed to us does not prove anything. Now we respond to the first reason: those names are not synonyms, and they do not signify four things, but only one, if it is said about one absolute thing; or only three, if it refers to relative things; Augustine seems to refer to this in book 1 chapter 5 *On Christian Doctrine,* when he says: *The things which are to be enjoyed are the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, a single Trinity, a certain supreme thing common to all who enjoy it.* But more clearly Anselm teaches in his book on the Incarnation of the Word that the three persons are three things, and one thing: the three things are relative, and the one is absolute. And it is not unusual that several names, which are not synonymous, signify one thing, but in a different way.

You will say: if those names signify one absolute thing, and three relative; therefore they signify four things. I respond that here there is no consequence, for that absolute thing is not distinguished really, but only logically from those three relatives; therefore in God there is a unity of essence, and there is a Trinity of persons, but there is no quaternary.

To the second argument I say that the Essence is those three, and the three are the essence. But that the essence does not generate, and the Father does generate, is not an argument for a real distinction, but only for a distinction of reason or a logical distinction. For, also man and humanity are one thing, and nevertheless a man generates, but humanity

does not generate.

To the third argument I deny that the essence is the fount of the persons or of the relations; for persons are produced by persons, but relations are not produced, inasmuch as they are relations, but per se they are a consequence of the production of suppositums. On this see St. Thomas, I, q. 40, a. 4 and 1 Sent., dist. 27, q. 1, a. 3. Indeed, Augustine in book 4, chapter 20 on the Trinity speaks in a contrary way when he says that the Father is the principle of the whole divinity. But there he does not want to say that the divinity is produced, but that the Father is the principle of all the divine persons, since he produces the Son by generation, and the Holy Spirit by spiration. He himself, however, is not generated or spiraled by any person.

To the fourth argument about the Creed I say that that argument is opposed to the Zwinglian, Benedict Aretius. For, in his history of the punishment of Valentinus Gentilis, in chapters 6 and 11, since he did not know how to respond to the argument of Gentilis, proves that the Father alone is one God, because in the Creed it is said, *I believe in one God the Father;* he asked for the help of one comma, which he said should be inserted between the words "God" and "Father."

Moreover, the Catholic Catechisms do not have that comma, and the ancient Fathers while explaining the Creed, always read it as "one God the Father," as Irenaeus says in book 1, chapter 2, Cyril in Catechism 7, Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed, and others. However, even if we were to distinguish God from the Father by the insertion of a comma, because of that a quaternary would not be introduced. For, there God would be distinguished from the Father, so that it would be signified by the name of God that not just the Father is included, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit. But just as for the Father to be called in the Creed "one God" is not opposed to the divinity of the Son, a point explained above more than once, especially since in the same Creed the Son is called "our one Lord," and still no one denies that the Father also is our one Lord. For, although the Catechisms, for the most part say, "and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord," still Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed writes that the "one" can be referred both to his Son, and to our Lord. For truly Christ is both the only Son of God, and our only Lord.

To the fifth argument I respond: since we say that God manifested himself in three persons, he wants us to say that God exists in three persons, and that this has been revealed to us by God. So when they ask, who is that God? Is it the Father? Is it the Son? I respond: it is the divinity, whether it is the Trinity, or it is the Father, or the Son, or the Holy Spirit. For in whichever of these ways it is answered, it is answered correctly. Similarly, those who say, if some Catholics speak in such a way that there are three persons in one God, they want to signify nothing else but that the three persons are one Godhead, one essence, one nature, and there should be no controversy about the words, since the matter is certain as Augustine points out very well in book 1, chapter 15 of his retractions.

CHAPTER IX

THE THIRD ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The third argument. The Father is unbegotten, and the Son is begotten; therefore there is not one God, otherwise the one God will be begotten, and not begotten, which implies a contradiction. Likewise. Generable and ungenerable differ more than just generically, like corruptible and incorruptible; therefore Father and Son differ more than just generically.

Likewise. Begotten and unbegotten are either accidents or substances. If the first, then there are accidents in God; if the second, then Father and Son differ substantially.

I respond to the first reason: if both propositions are affirmative, both are true, and there is no contradiction. For, God is begotten, and God is unbegotten, are not contradictory, because in the first proposition God is taken for the Son, in the second for the Father. But if the second is negative in this sense: God is begotten, and God is not begotten; or like this, God begets, God does not beget, then they are contradictory, but the first proposition is true, the second is false. The reason is because the name of God is taken absolutely for the persons indistinctly; but when it is said: God begets, or God is begotten, by reason of the notional predicate the subject "God" is restricted to one certain person. And so it is true, God begets, because the name of God is restricted to the Father. But when it is negative, the subject is not restricted by the predicate, because then nothing is asserted, but only denied. Therefore, when it is said: God does not beget, or God is not begotten, the meaning is that no divine person begets, no divine personis begotten and both propositions are false.

I respond to the second argument that the generable through motion differs generically from the ungenerable: for such a generable by its nature is corruptible; but the generable without motion or change, does not necessarily differ from the ungenerable. But it can be answered more easily: the generable and the ungenerable only then differ generically, when the nature of that which is generated is produced by generation; but that is not the case when it is only communicated to one from another. Then the Son is said to be generated, not because his nature itself was generated, or produced, but because the Son received it from the Father by generation. Therefore, the Son is not distinguished from the Father by nature, but only with regard to the way of having that nature. Thus, Adam was produced by no man, and Eve was from Adam alone, and Cain from Adam and Eve; however, all three were of the same specific nature. Justin gives this example in his work on the right confession of the Faith, Nazianzen in book 5 on Theology, Damascene in book 1, chapter 9, and Augustine in book 1, chapter 2 against Maximinus.

To the third argument I say that begotten and unbegotten are neither substances nor accidents; for, being unbegotten is the negation of procession, but "begotten" says a relation; as also paternity, and both active and passive spiration, are relations. However, divine relations are substantial reasons, and they are really the substance itself of God; but as they are distinguished logically from the essence, they do not say substance, because relation as relation is not a substance; and they are not accidents, because there is no accident in God. Augustine gives this response in book 5, chapters 3,4 and 5 on the

Trinity, where he neatly turns the argument back against the Arians: for, when it is said, *I and the Father are one:* he said: Are the Father and the Son said to be one according to substance, or according to accident? If the first, then the Father and the Son are of the same substance; if the second, then there are accidents in God. And he concludes finally with these words: these things are said not according to substance, but according to what is relative, which relative however is not an accident. See also St. Thomas I, q. 28, a. 2, where he teaches that in God there are two predicaments according to the nature of their own genus—substance and relation.

But you will say: If it does not pertain to the essence and substance of God to be begotten or unbegotten, why is it that it does not pertain to it? I respond with Augustine in the same place: there can be no accident in God, because every accident involves some composition and mutation. Hence it must be conceded that it is proper, natural and necessary for God simply that he be Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and therefore that one person is unbegotten, another begotten, another proceeding. However these things are natural and proper to God in such a way that they are not properly and formally of his essence. It is just as in created things, it is natural for an animal and necessary to be either rational or irrational, and still neither one is of its essence. However, animal pertains to the essence of both, that is, both man and brute animals. Thus, therefore, the divine essence essentially is included in the relations; for there is nothing in God which is not essentially God; otherwise is would essentially be a creature. However, relation itself is not included essentially in the essence, nor is it an accident in it, as has been said. Rather, this is perceived more clearly in our proposition: for, paternity, filiation, and spiration are relations; but relation according to its formal nature abstracts from substance and accident, for in God relation is substance, while in creatures it is an accident. See St. Thomas I, q. 28, a. 1, and De Pot., q. 8, a. 5, and Francis of Ferrara on CG 4, chap. 14, near the end.

CHAPTER X

THE FOURTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The fourth argument, to beget is the supreme perfection in a living being. But the Father has this perfection, the Son does not have it. Therefore the Son is not equal to the Father, and so the Father and the Son être not of the same nature; what follows from that is that there are not several persons of the same essence in God. And it is confirmed, because what is produced intrinsically affirms its dependence on another, and it comes after that by which it is produced, if not in time, certainly by nature. But the true God is a being from himself independent, and necessary, and it is not later than any other thing. Therefore the Son is not true God, since he was produced, and is dependent on the Father in his being.

I respond that to beget does say a perfection, but it is in no way lacking to the Son. For, in the Son there is all the perfection of active begetting, although the active begetting itself is not in the Son, because it is not a work; for, all the perfection which begetting has, it has from the essence; but the Son also has the whole essence. This will be more easily understood by anyone who observes that just as the formal principle of active generation is the divine essence, and so active begetting is an infinite perfection, so the formal terminus of passive begetting is the divine essence, and so it also is an infinite perfection, in fact it is absolutely the same infinite perfection.

You will say: if the formal terminus of divine begetting is the essence, then the essence is begotten at least *per accidens.* I respond that there is no consequence here. For, in creatures the nature, which is the formal terminus, is begotten *per accidens,* because the nature communicated to the son is not numerically the same one which is in the father, but another new one, which does not exist unless it is produced; therefore it is produced so that it can be communicated. But the divine essence is numerically the same in the Father, and it is communicated to the Son; therefore by generation it is not produced.

In order to prove this I respond: in creatures the son depends on the father, because he receives from him a nature that is numerically different from the nature of the father. But in God there is no dependence of this kind, because the same nature, which of itself is simply independent, is communicated by the Father to the Son, and it is done naturally and necessarily; hence there is only a mutual relation of the Father to the Son, and vice versa, but without any dependence in being.

For a similar reason it must be denied that every product is necessarily posterior; for production per se only requires some order between the producer and the product, but not priority, unless it is *per accidens* in creatures, where the new nature is educed from non-being to being. But among the divine persons there cannot be any priority or posteriority, since those persons do not have anything but essence and relation, and the essence is one and the same in all of them; but the relations require that they be by nature together.

CHAPTER XI

THE FIFTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The fifth argument. When the Son was begotten, either he was or he was not. If he was, why was he begotten? If he was not, therefore at one time he was not. Therefore he is not true God; therefore there are not several persons of the same nature.

Likewise. Either the Son always is begotten, or always was begotten, or at times he was being begotten, or at times had been begotten. If he is always being begotten, he will never obtain his terminus and perfection; if he always was begotten, by what means did he arrive at the end without a way? If at times he was being begotten, and at times was begotten, he did not always exist in the same way, but he was changed, all of which is absurd in God. Therefore several persons should not be affirmed in God.

Likewise. The Son preexisted in God either actually, or potentially, or not at all; if actually, then he existed before he was begotten. If potentially, then there is passive potency in God. If not at all, then he was made from nothing.

I respond to the first reason with Basil in book 2 on Eunomius that it must be denied that the Son existed before he was begotten, and it must be conceded that he existed when he was begotten. And it does not follow that he was begotten in vain; for it would happen in vain, indeed it could not happen that it existed before it came to be. But that which is when it becomes, does not become in vain; certainly in created things, moments of time both are when they become, and become when they are. Also it does not follow that the Son did not always exist, if it is denied that he existed before he was begotten; for he has always been begotten, and therefore also he always existed.

To the second argument Calvin responds in book 1, chapter 13, last number, that the Son was begotten once, and now is not being begotten; for he says it is stupid to imagine in God a continuous act of begetting. But Calvin is really opposed to Augustine in letter 174, chapter 4 to Pascentius, who says this: *The Father is always begetting, and the Son is always being born.* And he states an excellent reason for this, because if the Father at times begets, and afterwards ceases; therefore sometime he also begins to beget, and before that he was not begetting; therefore the Son is not eternal. But the same Augustine in question 37 of his 83 Questions, and Gregory in book 1, chapter 1 of his book on Morals say: it is better to say that the Son of God was always begotten, than that he was always being begotten, because he is always perfect and consummated.

Therefore to this argument I say: in divine generation there is whatever perfection there is in the process and in the term of generation, having removed all imperfection. In the process, which is expressed by the word "he is being born" is found the perfection of the act of being born, and the imperfection of the lack of the terminus; in the terminus, which is expressed by the phrase "he was born" is found the perfection of thing produced, but the perfection of the act of being born is lacking. Therefore, in God there is always nativity, but perfect; for the Son of God is always being born, but perfectly. And this is always to be born.

To the third argument I respond that something can be said to be in potency in

two ways. In one way in the active potency of the agent, and this properly belongs to suppositums that are produced; in a second way in the passive potency of matter, and this pertains to a form. For the suppositum is not educed from the potency of matter, but from the form. Now therefore if you consider the suppositum itself of the Son, it preexisted in the active potency of the Father, and this places no imperfection in the Father. For, passive potency says imperfection, but active potency says perfection. If you look at the form of the Son, that is, his essence, which Paul in Phil. 2:6 calls the form of God, it preexisted actually in the Father, not in potency, because it is common to both.

To the argument, when it is said: if he preexisted actually, then he existed before he became, I respond that that form was not made, but it was communicated; and it is not absurd, in fact it is necessary, that what was to be communicated preexisted. However, all of these things which reflect a certain priority are to be understood according to our way of understanding. For, in what concerns this matter, there is no priority, for the Father always was begetting actually, and he is begetting the Son.

CHAPTER XII

THE SIXTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The sixth argument. A person in God is either finite or infinite. If it is infinite, then there is only one; if it is finite, then there must be infinite persons to respond to the infinity of the essence.

Moreover: the multiplication of suppositums is either necessary for the preservation of the species, or so that one suppositum may be perfected by another. But God, since he is eternal, does not need preservation, nor perfection, since he is already most perfect.

Finally, person as person either says perfection, or it does not. If it says perfection, then one perfection is in one person, which is not in another; and since it is not an accident, it will be a substantial perfection in one, and not in the other. But if person as person does not say perfection, then the human person will be more perfect than the divine, for it is certain that the human does say perfection. I respond that the divine person as such is infinite, and therefore it does say the greatest perfection. But to the argument I respond that it cannot be concluded from it that therefore there is only one person. But only this can be concluded: therefore there is one perfection of all the persons. For, there is one and the same infinite perfection in all the persons, but not in the same way: for, in the Father that perfection is paternity, in the Son it is filiation, etc.

To the second argument I say that suppositums are multiplied in God not to preserve the species, or for one to be perfected by another, but because that is what is required by an intelligent being, which has two ways of producing something within itself, namely, knowledge and love. This is also the reason why there are only three persons, and not more, or fewer; for one must be producing, not produced; another is produced by knowledge; another is produced by love.

To the third argument I say that all the persons have the same perfection, but in a different way.

Perhaps you may ask: whether that way, that is, whether that relation says a perfection. I respond that a relation taken in general does not say a perfection, since it abstracts from real being, and is a being of reason. However, a real relation does say perfection, and a divine relation says infinite perfection. But this divine relation does not say one perfection, and another one something else, but they all say the same perfection, which is the divine essence.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The seventh argument. The divine intellect and will are the same, and similarly intellection and willing. Therefore also the Word and Love, that is, the Son and the Holy Spirit; for, from one only one thing proceeds.

Moreover, thinking in God, and intellection are the same thing, and similarly loving and love; therefore the Father and the Son are not distinguished from each other, nor from the Holy Spirit.

Finally, the Son either understands, or he does not. If he understands, he produces a notion or a word; if he does not understand, then the Word is not God, for he who understands nothing cannot be God. The same can be said about the Holy Spirit. For, if he loves, he produces love; then either himself, or another; if he does not love, he is not God; for God cannot lack the act of willing.

I respond to the first reason that a lesser distinction is required in principles than in their objects, as is clear from the fact that God has created so many different kinds of things, our mind produces so many concepts, one trunk of a tree produces so many branches. Accordingly, it happens that a logical distinction between the intellect and the will is sufficient for the purpose that they have really different objects.

To the second reason I say from that it is only proved that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are one in essence. For, in God thinking, or rather speaking, and the word are the same thing, with the exception of the producer and the product; and loving and love are the same thing, with the exception of the relation of the one producing love, and of the love produced.

To the third reason I say that the Son understands, and nevertheless he does not produce a notion, and the Holy Spirit loves, and nevertheless he does not produce love. For it should be observed that to understand and to produce a notion, as also to love and to produce love, are the same thing in reality, but they are distinguished logically. For, to understand and to love indicate an order and an object, that is, to the thing that is understood and loved; to produce a notion and love, indicates an order to the thing that is produced, that is, to the notion itself and the love; thus also the notion and the word are the same, but they are distinguished logically. For, a notion says order to an object, but a word to the one speaking. Therefore, the Father is understanding with both orders; and so he is also producing; the Son is understanding, but with the first order and not with the second, because he has the opposite order. Hence he is not speaking or producing a word.

In a similar way, the Father is the notion, but not the word; the Son is the notion and the word, because he has the order of a product, which the Father does not have. Hence St. Augustine in book 15, chapter 14 on the Trinity said: *The Father and the Son know each other, but the former by begetting, and the latter by being begotten.* Likewise, the Holy Spirit understands, and is the notion itself, but without the relations of producing or being produced. Hence he is not speaking, nor is he the word. I say the same thing about love; for, the Father and the Son love with the relation of producing love; the Holy Spirit loves, but with the relation of a produced love.

CHAPTER XIV

THE EIGHTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The eighth argument. In God there is nothing but essence and relation; but neither of these begets or is begotten. Therefore nothing in God begets, and nothing is begotten. Therefore in God there are not several persons.

Likewise. A true Son must be produced similar to the one who begot him; but the Word is not similar to the one who begot it, but to the object, as was pointed out. Therefore the Word of God is not the true Son of God, and so he is not of the same essence with God.

Likewise. The Holy Spirit is produced either similar to God the Father in essence, or dissimilar; but he is not similar, because he would be the Son, and then the Word would not be the only-begotten Son. Therefore he is dissimilar; therefore he is not true God; and therefore the three persons are not the one true God.

I respond to the first argument that neither the essence nor the relation taken separately beget, or are begotten, but it is constituted by both. Therefore what is constituted out of essence and paternity begets, and what is constituted out of essence and filiation is begotten, just as also in creatures the essence does not beget, nor the subsistence, but the person himself is the principle that begets, while the essence is the principle by which it begets, and the subsistence is the principle without which there is no begetting.

To the first proof, which was of this nature: the Word is not similar to the thinker, but it is to the thing understood; therefore the Son is not from the thinker. I respond that God, by understanding himself, produces a word, and therefore the thing understood, to which the word is similar, is God himself who produced the word.

But you will say: The word is not similar to God as understanding, but as understood. But God does not beget as understood, but as understanding. Therefore the Word is not similar to the begetter, and therefore it is not Son. Moreover, the Son is similar to the Father either in essence, or in property; he is not similar in essence, because in essence he is the same; not in property, because in that he is dissimilar; therefore in no way is he similar.

I respond that the Father must produce the Son similar to himself in essence, not similar in the relation of a producer, because he does not produce his own father, but his own Son. And therefore the Word must not be similar to the Father, as the Father is speaking, but as the Father has such a nature, which is expressed by his speaking.

But to the other point that was added: the Son is the same as the Father in essence, and therefore he is not similar. I respond that he is the same and he is similar; for, inasmuch as both have the same essence, they are the same in essence. However, inasmuch as they are two distinct persons, they also agree in that essence. Hence, since the Arians want the Son to be ὁμοιούσιον to the Father, and not ὁμοούσιον, the Fathers responded that he can indeed be said to be ὁμοιούσιον, but it must not be denied that he is ὁμοούσιον. On this see Hilary in his book on the Synods, near the end.

On the third argument which was on the Holy Spirit, I respond that the Holy Spirit is

produced similar in essence to the Father and the Son; but he is not a Son, but the reason for this is not so certain. If Scripture indeed teaches this, it is silent about the reason, not in this matter only, but also in many other things, so that it may always keep us occupied and have humble disciples. See Athanasius in his letter to Serapion, Gregory Nazianzen in book 5 on Theology, Basil in book 3 on Eunomius, Damascene in book 1, chapter 10, Augustine in book 5, chapter 27 on the Trinity, and in book 3, chapter 14 against Maximinus, and Tractate 99 on John, where they teach that this matter is something higher than what can be perfectly understood by us. Although Augustine thought of two reasons, which can however satisfy the mind of someone inquiring into this matter. For he says in book 5, chapter 14 of his book on the Trinity that the Holy Spirit is not a Son. because he does not proceed as being bom, but as being given. Then he adds in book 15, chapter 16 that he also cannot be said to be a Son, because he proceeds from two, who cannot be said to be two Fathers, nor one the father and the other the mother.

St. Thomas seems to have explained this problem more clearly in I, q. 27, a. 4 and in De Pot., q. 10, a. 2 ad arg. 22. For, he says that the Word of God is the Son of God, because, since he proceeds by an act of the intellect, he proceeds as a certain similitude or image of the one producing him, and he is that in virtue of the procession itself. And this matter is not truly understood, unless an idea is produced, or a Word, which is a similitude of the thing itself which is understood. But St. Thomas teaches that the Holy Spirit is not a Son of God, because although he is similar to the Father and the Son, he does not proceed as similar in virtue of his production, since he proceeds through an act of love; but love is not from its nature a similitude of the thing loved, but a certain impulse towards the thing loved.

CHAPTER XV

THE NINTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The ninth argument. Subsistence is either of the intrinsic nature of the essence, or it is not. If it is, then the essence is incommunicable, or if it is communicated, the subsistence is also communicated. And then the persons either have besides the subsistence, which they receive with the essence, another one of their own, or they do not. If they do have it, then there will be four subsistences, and therefore four persons. If they do not have it, then there will be only one subsistence. But if subsistence is not of the nature of the essence, then the essence is not infinite simply, since it does not contain all perfection; and also the divine persons will be composed of essence and subsistence, which is most absurd.

I respond that here a most difficult question is being raised, and concerning it the Fathers seem to be in disagreement. For, St. Augustine in book 7, chapter 4 on the Trinity says that it is one thing in God to be Father, and something else to be God. But in the same place he teaches that "to subsist" is said in reference to oneself, not to another, and therefore it is absolute and common to the three. Finally, he adds that it is one thing in God to subsist, as it is one thing to know, and just as there are not three wisdoms in God, so there are not three subsistences. And in chapter 6 he says, it is one thing to be a person, but something else to be God; although it is something else to be God, and to be Father. There St. Augustine seems to distinguish subsistence from relation, and to assert that there is one subsistence, but many relations.

Likewise Anselm in chapter 43 of his Monologue says that the divine persons through their own wisdom, essence and life subsist, know and live, and Boethius in his book on the two natures said: *That subsists that does not need another in order to exist; therefore what the Greeks call* οὐσίαν, we call subsistence. Richard has something similar in book 4, chapters 8 and 19 in his work on the Trinity. And St. Thomas himself in De Pot., q. 9, a. 5, ad 13 says that the relations have from the essence that they subsist, and on the other hand that they do not have their essence from the relations; elsewhere he often repeats the same thing often, and in I Sent, dist. 26, q. 1, a. 1 ad 4 he says clearly that there is one subsistence just as there is one essence.

The same thing can also be demonstrated by reason. For, to subsist is proper to a substance, not to a relation; therefore an essence does not have this from a relation, but from itself. And moreover, if it had it from a relation, it could not be explained how a true generation is in God, because relation follows generation, since it is founded on generation. But a subsistent suppositum precedes generation, since it could do nothing unless it were a suppositum. Therefore, how could the Father beget, if he did not have subsistent being except through a relation, and if he did not have the relation except after generation?

But on the other hand, John Damascene in book 1, chapter 6 in his work on the Orthodox Faith, on this point has this to say: ὁ του Θεοῦ λόγος τω μεν ὑφεστάναι καθ' εαυτόν, διήρυται πρός εκείνον παρ' ού ὑπόστασιν έκει, that is, the Word of God, because

it subsists per se, is distinguished from that which has subsistence, where in a sufficiently clear way he posits several subsistences. Likewise in the Sixth General Council, in session 11, it ordered the letter of Sophronius to be read and it accepted it later in session 13. In that letter it is repeated twice that the Trinity is numerable in its personal subsistences.

Moreover, in the Athansian Creed, and among all the Greeks, it is said that there is one hypostasis of the Father, and another one of the Son; but certainly several hypostases could not be affirmed, unless there were several subsistences. Just as we cannot say there are several Gods, because there are not several godheads; for, concrete substantive things are not multiplied, unless the forms are multiplied. Likewise. If there are not three subsistences, how are the three persons really distinguished? For, a real distinction cannot take place, where there are not distinct acts of existence or subsistences. But it is certain that the divine persons are not distinguished in their acts of existence. Likewise. If there are not several subsistences, how will it be established that the Incarnation took place in the hypostasis of the Son alone? Finally. If in God with only one subsistence there are several persons because of the multiplication alone of the opposed relations, why are there not also in Christ many persons because of the multiplication of the opposed natures, that is, of the creating nature and of the created nature? You can add to this that St. Thomas in I, q. 40, a. 3 says that the relations bring with themselves the persons, they do not presuppose them, and if the relations are mentally abstracted from the essence, the hypostases do not remain.

Therefore, in order to settle this difficult question, it seems to us that this should be said, namely, that the divine subsistence is partly one, partly many; partly absolute, partly relative; partly common to the three, partly proper of each one; finally, partly of the nature of the essence, partly not of the nature of the essence. In order to make this easier to understand, a few preliminary notes will be given.

The first note is from St. Thomas in De Pot., q. 8, a. 3 ad 7 that subsistence has two functions: one that it constitute the suppositum, and it makes it subsist in itself, that is, it does not depend on another; the second is that it distinguishes it from other supposituras, and these two functions are to be distinguished from each other. For, one can be before the other, as is clear in Adam who, when he was alone, had being in himself, but he was not distinguished from others. Likewise, it distinguishes something that it does not constitute, which is evident in the active spiration in God.

Note secondly that it is one thing to speak about subsistence with respect to essence, but something else with respect to persons. For, if we speak about an essence, it is not constituted by a relation, nor does it receive its subsistence from it, but it has in itself intrinsically subsistence; so that if we mentally separate relations from the essence, it will remain existing in itself, and distinct from all other essences, although it will not have in itself distinct persons.

Note thirdly: it is certain that the persons have distinction from the relation, and therefore subsistence regarding the second function; for, the divine persons must be distinguished by a minimal distinction, as St. Cyril in book 1 on the Trinity and St Thomas in I, q. 40, a. 2 ad 3 teach: but a minimal distinction is through a relation; the Fathers and the Councils passim teach this same thing, when they say that relation alone

produces distinction and number in God.

But from whence the divine persons have subsistence regarding the first function, the Fathers did not express themselves very clearly; however, with St. Thomas we say that the persons have their whole subsistence from relation, but not in the same way. For, relation includes essence, and adds to it a reference, because it is something to another; and inasmuch as it includes essence, it constitutes and gives to the person that it exist in itself; inasmuch as it says a reference, it distinguishes. But that this is the opinion of St. Thomas, anyone who has carefully studied his works will not deny, since he teaches everywhere that relation constitutes and distinguishes the persons. It constitutes it in order to be identified with the essence, but it distinguishes since it is a relation. See the following: De Pot., q. 8, a. 3 ad 7, q. 9, a. 5 ad 13, and q. 10, a. 5 ad 12. Contra Gentiles book 1, chapter 21 and 22, book 4, chapters 10, 14 and 49; and S.Th. I, q. 3, a. 3 and q. 29, a. 4 and q. 40, a. 2 and 4; I Sent., dist. 26, q. 1, a. 1 ad 4. But it may help to quote a few words of St. Thomas. Therefore, he says in De Pot., q. 8, a. 3 ad 7: *If the relations constitute the hypostases, still they do this inasmuch as they are the divine essence.* And in the same place ad 9: *The personal properties are not the principle of the subsistence of the divine essence; for the divine essence subsists of itself; but on the contrary, the personal properties have their subsistence from the essence.*

You will say: if relation does not constitute as relation, but as essence, therefore the essence itself constitutes it, not the relation. I respond: that is not so, since the same thing must be the principle constituting, and distinguishing, although it does not make both of them for the same reason; but it is certain that relation is a distinctive principle; therefore relation must also constitute, but it does it in such a way that it includes the essence.

Note fourthly that the subsistence does two things with regard to the first function, that is, when it constitutes the person. For, it both gives being per se and it confers incommunicability, although a divine relation does not give being simply per se, because the divine essence, since it has infinite perfection, includes essentially not only existence, but also to exist per se. However, it does give incommunicability, and it constitutes the suppositum. For the divine essence, although it subsists per se, still it is communicable because of its infinity; and therefore it is not a suppositum, but through relation it is so terminated, and that essential subsistence is quasi modified, so that constituted from essence and relation it is completely incommunicable. Wherefore the relation, although it does not constitute as relation, but as essence, inasmuch as 'To constitute" says to give simply being per se, as we said above briefly with St. Thomas, nevertheless it does constitute as relation, inasmuch as "to constitute" means to give being per se in an incommunicable way. Therefore in God, as he is one common and absolute subsistence, as is gathered from Augustine, Anselm, Richard and St. Thomas, so there are also three true, proper and relative subsistences, as is concluded from Athanasius, Sophronius, Damascene and the same St. Thomas. However, there are not four subsistences, but one and three, because the three relative subsistences are really the same with the absolute subsistence. Therefore, because of this explanation the arguments for both sides should cease.

With regard to the first argument: therefore the essence is incommunicable, I respond

by denying the consequence. For, the essence is not so communicated that what was existing in itself begins to be in another; for, it is always in itself, and never in another, since it is absolutely simple, and it belongs to its very nature to subsist. But what is in itself in one way, may be in itself also in another way. Therefore the essence of the Father is in itself, but with a relation of producing, and the essence of the Son is in itself, but with a relation of having been produced, etc.

Concerning this: *the persons either have their own subsistence, besides that of the essence, or they do not.* I respond that the individual persons have only individual subsistences, but that they are partly of the nature of the essence, and partly they are not, as was said above.

Concerning this for the second part: *therefore the essence will not be simply infinite.* I respond by denying the consequence. For, the essence contains intrinsically whatever perfection the subsistence has; for, as we said above, the relations do not say any other perfection but that which is the essence itself.

Concerning this: *therefore the person will be composed.* I respond by denying the consequence. For, the subsistence of the Father, inasmuch as it is distinguished from the essence, is a pure reference to another, and therefore it does not have reference to the essence itself, but only to the terminus.

Concerning the argument, which usually seems to be insoluble: the constitution of the suppositum precedes generation and generation precedes the relation; therefore, the suppositum is not constituted by the relation. I respond that the constitution of the suppositum does precede the generation, but the distinction of the suppositum follows after the generation, and because of that we say that the relation as such, which follows the generation, distinguishes the suppositum, it does not constitute it. But we say that the relation as it is identified with the essence, and precedes generation, according to our way of understanding constitutes the suppositum.

You will say: the relation also as identified with the essence, if it is a relation, requires some foundation, otherwise there will be no reason why it is paternity rather than some other species of relation. But no foundation of paternity can be conceived besides generation. Therefore in no way can paternity precede generation, and constitute the suppositum. I respond: relations that are accidents always require a foundation, namely, so that there is a reason why such a relation inheres in such a subject; but relations that are the essence itself of the subject require no foundation. For, just as no one asks why man is a rational animal, because that is his essence, so it should not be asked why the first divine person is subsisting paternity, because this is his essence. However, we do assign a foundation, namely, generation, why this first person is formally Father, and is distinguished from the Son.

But, you will say, St. Thomas in I, q. 40, a. 3 says, if the relations are mentally abstracted, the hypostases do not remain in God; therefore, subsistence in no way pertains to the nature of essence. I respond that St. Thomas wants to say that distinct hypostases do not remain, for he adds immediately that the word "hypostasis" signifies something distinct.

CHAPTER XVI

THE TENTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The tenth argument. Relation as it is distinguished from essence distinguishes the persons; but relation as it is distinguished from essence is not in the thing, but only in the mind; for, relation in the essence does not add something, but only a reason, otherwise there would be in God something really distinct from the essence. Therefore, the persons are not distinguished in reality, but only logically or mentally.

Moreover, the total reality which is in the Father is also either in the Son or it is not. If it is, then the Father and the Son are not really distinguished. If it is ηοζ then there is something in the Father that is not in the Son; and since it is something, there will be some goodness in the Father, which is not in the Son.

I respond that the reference which relation adds to the essence distinguishes the persons, but that reference is not just in the mind, but also in the reality, and as it is in reality to distinguish, for the persons are distinguished really, even if every operation of the intellect ceases. Therefore I respond to the proposition that the persons are not distinguished by the relations, inasmuch as the relations are distinguished from the essence in any way whatsoever, but inasmuch as they are real relations, or as they are really identified with the essence, and they are distinguished from it only logically.

To prove this I say that the whole absolute reality, which is in the Father, is also η the Son and in the Holy Spirit, but not the whole relative reality; for there truly are three real entities, but relative, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

Concerning the proof, when it is said that being, the true and the good are convertible, etc., I respond that those three entities are also three true things, and three good things, if these names are understood adjectivally, that is, they are three things having truth, and goodness, but there are not in them three truths, or goodnesses, but one. And the reason is, because a relation does not say a perfection inasmuch as it is to another, but inasmuch as it is something to another. But in God that "something" of relation is identified with the essence, and therefore a relation in God does not say a perfection other than the essence itself, which is one.

And hence there is this: when we say that in God there are three entities, or three things, or three subsistences, or three persons, we always add or understand that they are relative, and we never multiply or number absolute things, because it is of the nature of relation alone that it confers a true distinction without a multiplication of perfections, because by reason of itself the "to" has opposition, and therefore distinction; however, by reason of the "to" it does not say any perfection; but inasmuch as it does say perfection, it is identified with the essence. On this see Anselm in chapter 3 of his book on the Incarnation, where he says that the Father and the Son can be said to be two things, provided that by "things" relations and not substances are understood. And the Council of Toledo XI in canon 1, where we read that in relations number is perceived, but in the substance of the divinity what is numbered is not to be found. For, where a true number is admitted, there necessarily several entities are to be admitted.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ELEVENTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The eleventh argument. Acts of the intellect and of the will are immanent, and therefore sterile, as the Philosopher teaches in 9 Metaph. tex. i6, and therefore they do not produce anything. But if the Son and the Holy Spirit are not produced by the intellect and will, in no way are they produced; for it cannot easily be explained by what other means they are produced, and why only two persons are produced, and why one usually is called the Word and the other Love.

I respond that immanent acts, and therefore acts of intellect and will, which we can call intellection and love, do not produce anything that remains after the action; however, they do produce something intimate to the action itself, and which can be called by the name of the action itself. But the word "action" is taken in two ways, in one way for the bare action alone, which pertains properly to the predicament of action; and it is taken in another way for the action joined together with some quality, which is its quasi terminus. For example, we call heating something an action; however, it is not a simple action of the predicament of action, but it includes some heat that is acquired.

Thus therefore intellection and loving are not just bare actions, but they include also something by way of a quality, which is a quasi terminus of the action. Otherwise, if intellection were a bare action, how would the knower through intellection become similar to the thing known? Is not the similitude founded on the form or the quality? Therefore, the Philosopher does not say that through immanent actions absolutely nothing is produced, but nothing is produced that remains after the action, just as by transient actions something is produced that is really distinct from the action, and it remains after the action.

Therefore, by intellection the Word is produced, and by willing Love, which in us are accidents, but in God are substance, since in God "to understand" is his very being, but it is not that in us. Therefore the holy Fathers passim affirm that God the Father has begotten his Word from eternity, because he was knowing from all eternity; they would not have said this, unless they believed that the Word of God is produced by an act of the intellect. On this see Athanasius in sermons 1, 2 and 3 against Arius, Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, Nazianzen in book 3 on Theology, Cyril in book 1, chapter 5 of his Theses and book 12, chapter 7, Ambrose in book 4, chapter 4 on Faith, and Augustine in book 6, chapter 1 and book 7, chapter 1 on the Trinity.

Also, often the Fathers clearly teach that God the Word was produced by intellection, like Basil in his homily on the beginning of John, Cyril in book 1, chapter 5 on John, Theodoretus in book 2 for the Greeks, and Damascene in book 1, chapter 6. Finally, Augustine in all of book 9 on the Trinity calls the Son wisdom, and the Holy Spirit love; also, the Council of Toledo XI in chapter 1 calls the Holy Spirit charity.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE TWELFTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The twelfth argument. This mystery destroys three naturally known principles. The first one is this: Everything either is, or it is not; for paternity is the same thing really with the essence, and the essence is the same thing really with filiation. Therefore paternity is the same thing really with filiation, however it is not the same thing with filiation, if it is really distinguished from it. The second principle is: Two things equal to a third, are equal to each other; for, paternity and filiation are the same thing with the essence, and nevertheless they are not the same thing between themselves. The third principle is an expository syllogism: for when it is said: this essence is the Father, this essence is the Son, therefore the Father is the Son—and that seems to be a valid conclusion. However, it is a false conclusion, if the Faith is true.

I respond to the first statement by denying the first consequence, because the essence has itself by way of a common terminus, because, although it is singular, still it is truly in several suppositums. Therefore in predications it performs the function of a universal word, as St. Thomas pointed out in I, q. 39, a. 4 ad 1. Therefore just as this syllogism is not valid: Man is the same thing really with an animal; an animal is the same thing really with a horse; therefore man is the same thing really with a horse; in the same way this is also not valid: Paternity is the same thing really with the essence; and the essence is the same thing really with filiation; therefore paternity is the same thing really with filiation.

To the second principle I say that that principle is not true universally, except when the two things are equal to a third thing adequately, as in mathematics, where, if two lines are equal to a third, universally they will be equal to each other, because there is found complete adequateness.

However, if you say: man and horse are the same thing really with an animal; therefore they are the same between themselves—that is not valid, because man and animal are not the same really adequately; thus also the essence and paternity are not the same adequately, because the essence extends itself to more things. Nor is it true that that principle is the foundation of the whole human discourse, if no limitations are added, otherwise there would be so many figures in vain, and the modes of the syllogisms, whereby it is explained how two extremes are to be joined with the middle term, so that it can be concluded that they are also joined together. You can add to this that although that axiom is universally true in finite things, because of that it is not necessarily true in finite things, and because of that it is not necessarily true in divine things; for, if the rational soul, because it is spiritual, naturally is in the many really distinct parts of a body, then this syllogism is not valid: Hands and feet are the same in place with the soul; therefore they are the same in place between themselves. How much greater is the fact that God, who is infinite Spirit, can be at the same time in several suppositums.

Concerning the third principle: I deny that it is an expository syllogism. For, "this

essence" has itself by way of a common terminus, as has been said. Therefore, just as this is not valid: Some man is Peter; some man is Paul; therefore Paul is Peter; so this is not valid: This essence is the Father; this essence is the Son; therefore the Son is the Father. And until now we have been considering in a general way the distinction of the Trinity. Now in particular we will examine the distinction of the Father from the Son, which was the fourth part of the proposed debate.

CHAPTER XIX

WHETHER THE SON OF GOD IS SELF-GOD (AUTOTHEOS)

This is a new heresy, and I do not know whether it is a real heresy or just verbal. For, Genebrardus in book 1 on the Trinity refutes explicitly the heresy which they call "self deification," that is, of those who say that Christ is God from himself, not from the Father, and he attributes this heresy to Calvin and Beza; in the preface of their books there is an indication that Francis Stancarus was the first author of this heresy. Also Gulielmus Lindanus in Dialogue 2, which he entitled as "the Doubter," and Peter Canisius in the preface of his book on St. John the Baptist attributes the same error to Calvin. From the error it clearly follows that either the Son is not personally distinguished from the Father, which is the error of Sabellius, or certainly he is distinguished also by nature, and is not the Son of God, but some other principle; this error comes close to being Manicheism. Therefore I will explain what I think about this whole matter.

First, I could find nothing like this in Stancarus; but I do admit that I have not read all of his works, but only those that he wrote on the Trinity and on the Mediator. I think that Calvin according to his way of speaking without doubt was in error, and gave occasion that those things would be written about him, which have been written by our own people. For, in book 1, chapter 13 § 19 of his Institutes he says this: *At one time the ecclesiastical authors say that the Father is the principle of the Son, and at other times they assert that the Son has from himself both divinity and essence.* And after that: *Therefore when we speak simply about the Son without respect of the Father, we assert very well and properly that the Son is from himself* And in § 23, while speaking about the Son, he said: *How can the Creator, who gives being to all things, not be from himself, and have his essence from elsewhere?* And the same Calvin in his letter to the Poles, and in his book against Gentilis, passim says that the Son is ἀυτόθεον, that is, God from himself, and improperly, and he says that it is also awkwardly stated in the Creed—God from God, light from light.

But although this is the way things are, still when I examine this matter and carefully consider Calvin's opinions, I do not easily dare to pronounce that he was involved in this error. Since he teaches that the Son is from himself with respect to the essence, not with respect to the person, and seems to want to say that the person is begotten from the Father, that the essence is not begotten, nor produced, but is from itself, so that if you remove from the person of the Son relation to the Father, only the essence remains, which is from itself.

But why I think Calvin thought in this way, I will explain briefly, not so much in order to defend him, or to excuse him, who made himself unworthy with so many of his heresies, not only with the defense but also with the communion of Catholics; in order to show this it is not necessary to dwell on this question, since in fact it is not really a question.

First, Calvin admits in book 4, chapter 13 §13 of his Institutes that there is only one nature in the three distinct persons, and there he says that the Son is begotten by the

Father. But certainly it is not intelligible how the Son is from the Father, and has the saim nature with the Father, and does not have it from the Father: for the Son cannot be said ĸ be only a relation, but he must be something subsisting in the divine nature.

Moreover, in the same place in § 23 he says clearly that the essence was communicatee to the Son from the Father: *If there is distinction in the essence, let him respond, did hi not communicate it to the Son? But this could not take place only partially, because it h wicked to cut God in half Add to this that in this way they would destroy the essence q God; it remains that the whole essence is common to the Father and to the Son.* Those are his words, and in § 25 he says that the Son is begotten wisdom, and the Father is the fount of the Godhead.

Finally, those who say that the Son has his essence from himself, err in this because they are forced, either to make the Son unbegotten, and the same person with the Father or to multiply the essences, or certainly to distinguish the essence really from the person and so to introduce a quaternary in God. But Calvin in book 1, chapter 13 §19 says thaï the Son was begotten by the Father, and he places only one essence in the three persons Likewise in § 23 he teaches that the essence of the Father was communicated to the Son Finally, in § 23 he does not distinguish the essence from the persons really, but onlj logically or mentally.

Secondly, I prove it from the cause which forces Calvin to this opinion. It was th cause, because Valentinus Gentilis constantly claimed that only the Father is ἀυτόθεοι and by this name he understood that only the Father truly has the divine and uncreated essence; but the Son and the Holy Spirit have another essence produced by the Father and therefore regarding the essence that they are not from themselves. Therefore, Calvin, wants to oppose Valentinus, namely, by saying that the Son is from himself as to his essence, that is, in the sense in which it was denied by Valentinus.

Thirdly, I prove my point from the teaching of his disciples. For, Beza in numbei 14 of his axioms on the Trinity says that the Son is from the Father through an ineffable communication from eternity of the whole essence; and nevertheless he also with his Teacher makes Christ a self-God. Likewise, Josias Sinterus, a follower of Calvin in the letter to the Poles, defends the self-Deity of the Son, and in the following way explains his own and Calvin's opinion: *We do not deny that the Son has his essence from the Father, but we deny a begotten essence;* I do not see how this opinion of Josias cannot be called Catholic.

It remains that the way of speaking of Calvin, who says that the Son has his essence from himself, must be simply repudiated, and we will demonstrate that it is necessary to speak in a contrary way. First of all, therefore, his way of speaking conflicts with the word of God. For, we read in John 5:26: *The Father has granted the Son also to have life in himself* And John 6:57: *Hive because of the Father.* But if the Father gave life to the Son, certainly he gave him also his essence, for it is the same for God to be and to live. Likewise in Matt. 11:27: *All things have been delivered to me by my Father.* Why not also his essence? John 7:29: *I know him, for I come from him.* And chapter 8:26: *I declared the world what I have heard from him, etc.* But it cannot be understood how the Father granted to the Son knowledge, unless he conferred on him his essence, as we said above

from Augustine.

Secondly, he is in conflict with the Councils. For almost all the Councils after Nicaea accepted the Nicene Creed with the words, *Godfrom God, lightfrom light,* as at Sarda, Constantinople I, Ephesus I and all the others. But the pride ofCalvin is really intolerable, since he reprehends the form ofspeaking, which all ofthe principle Councils approved. And in this matter Calvin is not unlike the Arians; for, in the Council ofAquila St. Ambrose could never get the two Arian heretics to say that the Son is true God from true God; for they always responded to him that the Son is the true only-begotten Son of the true God, and similar statements; but never that he is God from true God, even though they were asked this question about a hundred times. And from Calvin at the Council of Lausanne it happened that he would never admit that the Son is God from God. This is reported by Peter Carolus, who was present, in his letter to Cardinal Lotharing.

Thirdly, he is in conflict with the teaching ofthe Fathers. For, Gregory Thaumaturgus says in his Creed that the Son is God from God. And before him, Justin at the beginning ofhis book on the confession ofFaith said: *The Father has the essence unbegotten, the Son has it begotten.* Epiphanius in Heresies 69 calls the Son God from God. Hilary at the beginning ofbook 4 on the Trinity said: *The Son has nothing except what he was born with, that is, he has everything because ofhis birth.* Augustine in Tractate 31 on John said: *Whatever the Son is, he isfrom him whose Son he is; therefore we say that the Lord Jesus is Godfrom God, lightfrom light.*

Fourthly, Calvin is in conflict with reason, and with his own opinion. For, if he himself asserts that the Father communicated his essence to the Son, then how can he truly say that the Son has his essence from himself? Likewise, ifhe says that the Son was produced by the Father, how can he deny that the essence and life in the Son are from the Father? For the Son is not said to be only a property, but he is an integral hypostasis.

Add to this that his reasons are not valid. For, in the first place, Calvin says that he is moved by the authority ofthe Fathers, who sometimes say that the Son is from himself. But he cites Augustine on Ps. 110 and Cyril in book 7 on the Trinity, who say that the Father and the Son are one principle. From this it seems to follow that both the Father and the Son lack a principle, and therefore that they are from themselves. Similarly he cites Augustine who, on Ps. 69 at the beginning ofTractate 39 on John, says that the Son is said to be to the Father, but God is to himself, as the Father to the Son is called Father, but to himselfhe is called God.

But those arguments do not conclude anything. For, we say that the Father and the Son are one principle with respect to creatures; and what agrees with that is that the Father is a principle without a principle, but the Son is a principle from a principle, as Augustine explains in Tractate 39 on John. There, when explaining the words: *Who are you? Iam theprinciple speaking to you,* he says that the Son is a principle, but he is from a principle, just as he is God from God, light from light. And it is not the same thing that the Son is God for himself, and God from himself. For, the first part signifies that the name ofGod is not relative, and nevertheless is suitable for the Son; and Augustine says this, and he speaks the truth, because even though the Son is a relative, still it is a subsistent relative, divine, and therefore including the essence, which is absolute. But

that the Son is God from himself signifies that the Son of God is not the Son of God, but unbegotten, which Augustine never said, but Calvin falsely attributed it to him.

The second reason of Calvin is this: if the Son did not have his essence from himself, he would be God only by request, indeed a titular God, and really like creatures, who receive their being from some other source.

I respond that this argument concludes very well against Gentilis, who said that the Son does not have his essence from himself, because he thought he had a created essence from the Father. But those consequences have no validity against us; for, although we say that the Son has his essence from the Father, still we say that he has it by a necessaiy and natural communication, and therefore it is not by request, but that he is naturally God. Likewise we say that he receives from the Father the same essence which the Father has, and therefore that he is not a titular God, but the true and real God.

The third reason of Calvin is this: because the Son is said to be Yahweh like the Father, and this name signifies Being Itself, or the fountain of being, and therefore it is from itself as to its essence.

I respond that this argument also concludes very well against Gentilis, because if the Son is the fount of being, therefore he does not have his essence derived from another essence, but he has that one essence on which all essences depend. However, just as he is said to be God from God, and principle from principle, so he can be said to be the fount of being, as St. Augustine says in book 7, chapter 2 on the Trinity, and in book 15, chapter 14, where he says about the Son that he is: *Godfrom God, lightfrom light, wisdomfrom wisdom, essencefrom essence,* and nevertheless that the Father and the Son are one God, one light, one wisdom, one essence. But it should be observed there that he accepts abstract names for the concrete, since he said essence from essence, wisdom from wisdom.

In this place it should be added that both the Father and the Son can be said to be άυτόθεον, but in a different meaning than that which Valentinus and Calvin give to the word. For, if άυτόθεος signified the one who is God from himself, as they think, certainly neither the Father, nor the Son could be said to be άυτόθεος; for, the Son is not God from himself, but from the Father; the Father also is not God from himself, but from no one. For, to be from oneself is to be a product from oneself, but the Father is simply unbegotten, and not produced. And the way of speaking of Lactantius is not to be approved, for in book 1, chapter 7 he says that God was produced from himself. But άυτόθεος can signify the one who is God himself, that is, truly God; for, as we say, this is the truth, and the Greeks say άυτηαλήθεια likewise άυτάδελφος proper, or a true brother, άυτεξούσιος of one's own right, and with this meaning Epiphanius in Heresies 69 calls the Son of God άυτοτέλιον and άυτόθεον, that is, *truly perfect and truly God.*

CHAPTER XX

ON THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT FROM THE SON

The last part of the dispute about the distinction of the persons is still to be handled. In this explanation there is the problem about the distinction and procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son; this is a controversy that must be treated, both because of the Armenians, Greeks, Ruthenians, Russians who still continue in a state of error, and also because of the new Arians. For, Valentinus Gentilis in theses 36 and 37 says that only the Father is the source of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.

And since the Greeks not only do not believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, but also accuse the Latins of adding to the Creed the word *Filioque* without their agreement, three problems must be handled. First, on the origin of this heresy and schism; second, concerning the time when the addition was made; third, whether the Latins could or should have added that word to the Creed.

On this whole matter see the Master (Peter Lombard) with the Doctors in book 1, d. 11, Anselm in his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit, St. Thomas in his little book on the error of the Greeks and his De Pot., q. 10, a. 4 and 5; Richard Armachanus in book 6 on the question about the Armenians, Gennadius Scholarus in chapter 1 of his little book for the Latins, and Hugo Etherianus on the procession of the Holy Spirit. Finally, Bessarion in his Dogmatic Oration, and the Council of Florence.

CHAPTER XXI

ON THE ORIGIN OF THE HERESY THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT DOES NOT PROCEED FROM THE SON

The first author of this heresy seems to have been Theodoretus (who however later was reconciled to the Church with the help of Pope St. Leo, and he was restored to his Diocese from which he had been removed) with others who favored Nestorius, and this took place about 430 A.D. For, what Bishop Justinian of Sicily says was in the preliminary notes of the Fifth Synod, and he said it in a letter to Peter, namely, that Macedonius taught that the Holy Spirit was spirated by the Father alone, is in no way probable. For, Macedonius agreed with the Arians about the Holy Spirit, according to Augustine, in chapter 52 of his work on the heresies. But the Arians said that the Holy Spirit is a creature of the Son, as St. Basil says in book 2 on Eunomius. There he says they were wont to prove from the fact that the Son is less than the Father, that the Father created a certain small God, that is, the Son; but the Son was not able to create a God—neither large nor small, but he produced the Holy Spirit, who in no way is God.

You can add to this that the second Council was assembled against Macedonius, and still it placed in the Creed that he proceeds from the Father. But perhaps we have an incorrect copy of that letter, and for "he spirates" Macedonius read it as "he separates' the Holy Spirit from the Father alone. For, Macedonius separated the Spirit from the Father alone, because he says he was made by the Son alone.

Therefore the refutations of the anathemas of St. Cyril published by Theodoretus still exist, both in the tomes of the Councils and in the works of St. Cyril. In chapter 9 of these refutations Theodoretus says clearly that the Holy Spirit is not from the Son, nor through the Son, but from the Father alone. There is also in the tomes of the Councils and in the works of St. Cyril, and in the recently edited Council of Ephesus in tome 2, chapter 37, the Nestorian Creed, in which it also says that the Holy Spirit does not have his subsistence through the Son, but that it is from the Father alone.

However, since the Nestorians mentioned this matter only in passing, and there was another matter at the time that occupied them, it does not seem that this error was a burning issue. For, no authors are found who treat this matter until the year of the Lord 767. But in that year, Ado of Vienna writes in his Chronicle, the great Council of Gentiliacus was held, and there was a debate in the presence of King Pepin, the Father of Charlemagne, between the Romans and the Greeks on the Trinity and sacred images. Rhegino, Sigebertus and Abbot Uspergensis in the Chronicle mention this dispute and the Council. And it seems that no other question between the Greeks and the Latins could be treated except that about the procession of the Holy Spirit; for there is no other controversy about the Trinity, nor was there, between the Greeks and the Latins.

Then after about a hundred years during the time of Nicolas I, who was Pope in 860, the Greeks began to contend openly with the Latins about this matter. For at that time Theophylact was flourishing. He wrote on chapter 3 in John and he explicitly accused the Latins of believing that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. And John Diaconus, who

lived at the same time, in book 4, chapter 75 in his life of St. Gregory says that the Greeks translated the Dialogues of St. Gregory into Greek, and that they seized the phrase "he proceeds from the Son" *(Filioqué),*

Moreover, after another 200 years, that is, in the year 1054, at the time of Leo IX, the full schism began, so that only the seeds of it seem to have been planted earlier. For in that year, while Constantine X was Emperor, who was called "Monomachus," Michael, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who really wanted to be the universal Patriarch, whose dignified name his predecessors had already usurped long before, began to proclaim that the Roman Pontiff and all the other Latins were excommunicated, because contrary to the decree of the Council of Ephesus they had added something to the Creed. He also said that, since the Roman Bishop was deprived of his See, the primacy of the Church rightly fell on himself, since he was the first Bishop after the Roman. And then the Greek Bishops not only did that, but they also ordered closed all the Churches of the Latins which were under their authority. The Emperor also offered a reward to those who would write something against the Latins.

That this was the situation can be known from the letters of Leo IX to the Emperor Constantine and to Michael the Patriarch. It can also be known from Anselm, who in that centuiy wrote his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit against the Greeks; likewise from Sigebertus in the Chronicle for the year 1054, and from St. Anthony in part 3, tome 22, chapter 13 § 11 of his History. These points concern the origin of this schism. But exactly when the "Filioque" was added to the Creed is not fully certain. Antoninus in § 10 of the work cited says that an objection was made by the Greeks to Nicolas I, because he had added it to the Creed; but a record of this is not found in the ancient histories, and also at the Council of Florence in session 7 Andreas, the Bishop of the Colossians, who defended the position of the Latins, said that the Greeks did not make an objection to Nicolas, even though they sought every occasion of blaming him. Finally, it is certain that this addition is much more ancient. This Andreas in the same place says that at the time of the Sixth Council, that is, after the year of the Lord 600, this addition had been made by the Roman Pontiff in a large Council of the Latin Fathers, because of certain disagreement which had arisen in Gaul and in Spain.

And although we cannot determine the year for certain, or a definite Pontiff, still it seems surely to have been done at this time. For, at the Council of Toledo VIII the Creed was recited with this addition. But this Council was held about the year of our Lord 653, and before this time the Constantinople Creed is not found with this addition; for, at the Council of Toledo III, which occurred in the year 589, the Creed is read without any addition. Also a sign of this matter is the question, which we said was treated between the Greeks and the Latins at the Council of Gentiliacensis, because the Latin Church had already begun to use the Creed with the addition. The Greeks raised a question about it. Another sign of this matter is that in session 7 of the Seventh General Council the same Creed was recited with the addition. But it should be known that that addition had been accepted in Spain and Gaul before it was accepted in Rome by the Sovereign Pontiff. For there exists in the Vatican Libraiy after the letters of the Pontiffs put together by Cresconius, a collection of letters between the Pontiff Leo III and the legates of Charlemagne. In them

the legates say that in Gaul the Creed is sung with the word "Filioque," and they ask the Pontiff to approve it and to order it sung in the same way also in Rome. But all of this agrees with the Chronicle of Ado and the Annals of the Franks written by Annonius, as is believed, in which we have a report of the Council of Aquisgranus, held in 809, on the procession of the Holy Spirit, which then sent a legation to Pope Leo.

But what some authors say, namely, that this word was added at the Council of Rome by Pope Damasus at that time, when the Council of Constantinople I was held—and they consider the two Councils to be one General Council—I do not see how this can really be defended. There is indeed in the works of St. Jerome a Creed under the name of Damasus, in which this word is contained. But we are not asking who put in his Creed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, but we are asking who added it to the Creed of Constantinople. We can prove that it was not Damasus with the following arguments. For, if that were the case, why is no mention of this matter found either in the first tome of the Councils, or in book 9, chapter 16 of the threefold distinction? How could Theodoretus, a very learned man, and who in his History included the letters of the Council of Constantinople to Damasus, and those of Damasus to the Council, be ignorant of that addition? For, that he did not know about such an addition is gathered from the fact that he wrote so boldly that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son.

Likewise, why did Pope Leo III order the Creed of Constantinople to be written on silver plates without that addition, as Peter Lombard recounts in 4 Sent., dist. 11? Perhaps Leo did not know about the acts of his predecessors? Or rather, did he want to define the contrary version? Why did the legates of Charlemagne petition the same Pope that they receive the Creed with that word included? Why, finally, did the Greeks not raise this question before the year 600? And on what pretext did they dare to say that the Latins sinned against the canons of Council III, by the addition of that word, if it had already been added in Council II? Therefore, what we said above remains, namely, that the addition was made after the year 600 of the Lord.

CHAPTER XXII

IT IS SHOWN FROM THE SCRIPTURES THAT THE SPIRIT PROCEEDS FROM THE SON

Now, therefore, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son is to be demonstrated first of all from the Scriptures. The Lord says in John 16:15: *All that the Father has is mine.* And in John 17:10: *All thine are mine.* So from these words this argument can be made: Whatever the Father has, the Son also has, with the exception only of paternity, as Augustine explains it; but the Father is the principle of the Holy Spirit; therefore the Son is also. Hence Augustine in book 5, chapter 14 on the Trinity said: *The Son is everything that the Father is, except being Father, because he is the Son, and the Father is Father.* There Augustine, based on the words of the Lord, teaches that the Son is completely the same with the Father, with the exception of the relation of paternity. From this it clearly follows that the Son is also the spirator of the Holy Spirit, because this is not to be Father, and nevertheless it belongs to the Father that he be spirator.

Then if the Father and the Son did not have all things in common, with the exception of the opposed relation, they would be distinguished more than by a relation, and therefore they would be distinguished by substance. For, the Father as spirator is not relative to the Son; therefore if as spirator he is distinguished from the Son, he is distinguished by spiration, not as it is a relation, but as it is a certain form subsisting in the Father. Therefore the Father and the Son differ in substance, which is the Arian heresy.

Secondly, it is proved from these words of the same chapter: *He will glorify me, for he will take what is mine and declare it to you.* What, I ask, will the Spirit receive from the Son except knowledge? For, shortly before that he said that he speaks not from himself, but he will speak whatever he hears, and this is explained as knowledge by Chrysostom, Cyril and Augustine, and also by Theophylact and Eutymius. But how can the Spirit receive knowledge from the Son, unless it is by receiving his essence from him? For if it is in any other way, then the Holy Spirit becomes a creature.

Theophylact and Eutymius suggest two solutions. First, they say that the Spirit receives from the knowledge of the Son, because he teaches nothing contrary to what the Son taught. Then they add the expression "what is mine" signifies from my treasure, which is the Father; as if the Son were to say: *the Spirit will receive it from the same source from which I received it.*

But certainly the first solution is not valid, because Christ not only says, *he will take what is mine,* but also he says, *he will not be speaking from himself;* there he clearly says that the knowledge of the Holy Spirit does not come to him from himself, but from the Father and the Son. The second solution is also not valid; for, the treasure of knowledge in God is not the person of the Father precisely as Father, but the divine essence, which is common to the Father and to the Son. For, both the treasure and knowledge signify absolute perfection, which doubtless is what the essence is. Therefore St. Paul says about the Son in Col. 2:3: *Christ Jesus in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* Therefore, the Spirit, by receiving from this treasure, receives necessarily from something common to the Father and the Son; and therefore he does not receive

more from one than he does from the other. Hence Didymus in book 2 and Cyril in his comments on this text confess that from this it is deduced that the Spirit is from the Son.

But you will ask: Why did he say "what is mine," and not rather, *he will receive my essence or my wisdom?* And why does he say in the future, *he will receive,* and not rather in the past, *he has received?* I respond: he said, *he will take what is mine,* because the Holy Spirit, proceeding from the Son, did not receive everything that is in the Son. For he did not receive the filiation, but the essence, from which also by filiation the Son is constituted according to our way of thinking. And the Lord himself indicated this when he said: *All that the Father has is mine; therefore I said that he will take what is mine,* that is, he will receive what is common to me and to the Father, but not what is proper to each one. But the reason why he speaks in the future is because that acceptance is eternal, and it contains in itself virtually all times, and it can be accommodated to all times. Hence St. Augustine, when explaining this text, says: *He will be, he was, he is. He will be, because he will never be absent; he was, because he was never lacking; he is, because he always is.* Therefore, since all times are contained in eternity, and all propositions about eternal things are true, whenever they are expressed, Scripture expresses various times, according as the matter it is considering requires. But in this place the Holy Spirit is described as a legate sent by the Father and the Son to the Apostles. But legates usually receive their instructions when they are sent; therefore he says, *whatever he shall hear, and he will receive what is mine.*

Thirdly, it is proved from the same text, where we read: *If I do not go away, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you* (John 16:7). And in chapter 15:26: *When the Paraclete comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father.* Every mission is either by command, as servants are sent by their lords, or by counsel, as those are said to be sent who are instructed by wiser teachers, as when the sick are sent by a doctor to get some medicine; or by natural production, as trees are said to send out roots, to produce flowers, etc. But it is certain that the Holy Spirit cannot be sent as a servant, or as one ignorant by someone wiser. For it is certain among us and the Greeks that the Holy Spirit is God; therefore his mission will have to be understood according to a production. And this same idea is confirmed by Augustine in book 4, chapters 19, 20ff. of his treatise on the Trinity; for, he says that for the Son to be sent is for him to be begotten, and for the Holy Spirit to be sent is for the Holy Spirit to proceed.

The Greeks respond that the mission of the Holy Spirit through the Son, or from the Son does not mean a procession, with regard to the internal subsistence, but an external mission to the creature by the granting of gifts. And since the son also gives grace, Faith, hope and charity to men, so also he is said to give, or to send the Holy Spirit, because he does indeed give gifts, which are said to be of the Holy Spirit.

But certainly when the Holy Spirit is said to be given or to be sent, not only are created gifts given, but with those gifts also the Holy Spirit is truly given and sent; and to assert the contrary is a manifest error. For in Rom. 5:5 it is said: *God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit who has been given to us.* There you see clearly that the Holy Spirit is distinguished from his gifts, and that both are given. Similarly in 1 Cor. 6:19: *Your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, which you*

have from God. And after that: *So glorify God in your body.* But certainly the gifts of the Holy Spirit are not God, nor do they constitute a temple. And in 1 John 4:16: *He who abides in love abides in God, and God abides in him.* Therefore not love alone abides in us, which is not God, but God himself truly abides in us. Finally, there is what is said in John 16:7: *If I do not go away, the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you.* And John 14:16: *He will give you another Paraclete, etc.* These texts are only absurdly explained as referring to gifts; for, gifts do not come, nor are they sent, nor can they be conferred with Christ, as one Paraclete with another.

Finally there is a very evident reason: for if the Spirit is said to be sent by the Son, because the Son is the author of gifts, it could also be said that the Father is sent by the Son, indeed both the Father and the Son by the Holy Spirit, because each person is the author of all the gifts. Likewise, if for the Spirit to be sent by the Son would be for his gifts to be sent, since we also read that the Son was sent by the Father into the world, those who do not believe it could respond that it was not truly the Son who was sent, but some created gift, and so the mystery of the Incarnation would be made void.

Perhaps they will say that the Holy Spirit does indeed come to us, but he is said to be sent by the Son, because he was the cause of it by his merits that the Holy Spirit should come to us. But in this way it could also be said that the Father is sent by the Son; for, by his merits he was also the cause that the Father comes to us, according to this text in John 14:23: *If a man loves me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and* ire *will come to him.* For a similar reason, if they should say that the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son, because the Son agrees that he should come, in the same way I could say, that the Father is sent by the Son and the Holy Spirit.

There is no obstacle from the fact that in Isa. 48:16 and 61:1 the Son is said to be sent by the Spirit, even though he does not proceed from him. For, the Son is sent by the ῥίπζ inasmuch as he is a man, according to which form truly the Son is from the Holy Spirit, as from an active cause. This is clear from Luke 4:18: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon men, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor.* According to this form, therefore, the Spirit sent the Son, according to which he is upon him, and anointed him. Since that is so, either it is necessary to delete from the Gospel those words of Christ about the Holy Spirit, namely, "I will send him," or certainly it must be conceded that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son through an internal and eternal production of his hypostasis.

But why the Son says "I will send" in the future tense, since the procession is eternal, is easy to explain. For, a mission implies a double relation—one to him who sends, the other to him to whom he sends. Regarding the first relation, the mission is eternal, and it can be verified at any time, but regarding the second relation, it is temporal. For, the Holy Spirit is sent to men, when he begins to be in them in a new way, that is, by knowledge and love, that is, when he begins to be known and to be loved through the gifts infused by him. Therefore, since that mission regarding the terminus "to which" was future, regarding the terminus "from which" always was, is and will be. Therefore, "I will send" was said, for thus it is a true proposition regarding the whole nature of the mission.

Fourthly, it is proved from this in John 20:22: *He breathed on them, and said, receive*

the Holy Spirit. For, by this ceremony, as is explained by Augustine in book 3, chapter 14 on Maximinus and Cyril in book 12, chapter 3 on John, Christ wanted to signify that the Holy Spirit proceeds from himself. But Theophylact in chapter 3 of his comments on John ridicules this argument, but without any effect; for he himself can give no reason for this ceremony. Moreover, much more leaned than he, more holy, and more ancient are Cyril and Augustine, who make use of this argument. And I do not doubt but that he himself should be laughed at, not only by the Latins, if he wants to ridicule Augustine, but also by the Greeks, if he ridicules Cyril.

Fifthly, it is proved from Rom. 8:9: *Any one who does not have the Spirit of Christ does not belong to him.* And Gal. 4:6: *Because you are sons of God, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba! Father!* For, why is the Holy Spirit called the Spirit of the Son? Certainly not because he is his servant, or because he is his brother, or because he is spirated by him, as he is also called the Spirit of the Father. Rom. 8:11: *If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead, etc.* And Matt. 10:20: *The Spirit of your Father is speaking through you.*

Perhaps they will say that the Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the Son, because together with him he proceeds from the Father, or because he is like him, or for some other reason, but not because he is spirated by the Son. But if that is so, why could it not also for the same reason be said that Christ is the son, or the word of the Holy Spirit, but we read this nowhere. Nor can it be responded that the Son has a relation to the Father, and the word to the one speaking; for, the Spirit also has a relation to the one spiraling. Therefore, just as the Holy Spirit, although he is not spirated by the Son, can be said to be the Spirit of the Son, because he is similar to him in essence, and together with him proceeds from the Father, so also the Son, although he is not begotten by the Holy Spirit, can be said to be the Son of the Holy Spirit, because he is similar to him in essence, and together with him proceeds from the Father. But St. Augustine considered this argument so important, that in tractate 99 on John he was satisfied by this argument alone in order to prove that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF THE COUNCILS

I cannot help but wonder with what impudence Jeremias, who calls himself the ecumenical Patriarch, recently has dared to write in his censure for the confession of the Lutherans that it was defined at the Council of Nicaea, and at all the following General Councils, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. For this is what he says in chapter 1 of the Censure: *The Nicene Synod, and the others agreeing with it, all decreed that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.* That is what he says. And if that is not a lie, then I do not see what could ever be called a lie.

And so that we may not suspect that it is some kind of secret canon, in which a decree of this kind is contained, the same Jeremias adds this: *The sacred and incorrupt confession of the Christian Faith explains this sacred Creed with these very clear words: namely, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone; this decision was confirmed by the divinely inspired Fathers at the First Council of Nicaea, then at Constantinople I by 150 Fathers. Likewise, the remaining five universal Synods, adding nothing, deleting nothing, gave witness to this while agreeing to its truth in the one Holy Spirit.* That is what he says.

Therefore, let us consult the Nicene Creed, and let us see whether it teaches in clear words that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone. From among the Greeks, the whole Nicene Creed is reproduced by Cyril in book 1 on the Trinity and in the book on the explanation of the Creed. From among the Latins, Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 6 of his History says that there is nothing else in the Creed about the Holy Spirit except this clause, και εις το άγιον πνεύμα, *and in the Holy Spirit.* But Nazianzen says in letter 2 to Celidonius that the Nicene Council did not hand on a perfect teaching on the Holy Spirit, because the question about the Holy Spirit had not yet been raised. Therefore, let us see in what Nicene Creed Jeremias read that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone.

Of course the Council of Constantinople I added these words to the Creed, *Who proceeds from the Father;* but it does not say in clear words, as Jeremias says, *Who proceeds from the Father alone.* For, the word "alone" is an addition made by Jeremias, and it is not the proper word of the Council. But why the Council did not add the words "from the Son," but thought it was sufficient to say "who proceeds from the Father" is certainly because at that time there was no doubt as to whether the Spirit proceeds from the Son. For, the heretics concede that, as is certain from Basil in book 2 on Eunomius; but there was some doubt about the Father, from whom the heretics said that the Holy Spirit is completely foreign as being a creature of the Son alone. Therefore the Council, in order to remedy this error, placed in the Creed what was necessary.

Therefore, the above points having been made, we will now cite the Councils which bear witness to the fact that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. First, the Council of Alexandria was held and from that Council Cyril writes a letter to Nestorius, in which we find these words: *He is called the Spirit of truth, and Christ is the truth, therefore he proceeds from him just as he proceeds from the Father.* This letter is had at the Council of Ephesus in Tome 1, chapter 14, and it was approved both by the Council of Ephesus

itself, and by the Fourth Council in session 5, and by the Fifth Council in its final session, and by the Sixth Council in session 17, and by the Seventh Council in session 7.

Therefore we have five General Councils celebrated among the Greeks who receive a certain and clear decree that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son just as he does from the Father. Therefore what are they now asking for? What are they seeking? What about the fact that in the Seventh General Council the Creed is read with the addition of the "Filioque" and nevertheless that Council was composed for the most part by Greeks?

But certain Greeks at the Council of Florence in sessions 5 and 7 said that that word is not found in their codices; however, the Latins produced an ancient example in which there was no sign of corruption, and they also cited an ancient historical witness of this matter. And it is certain that it never was the custom of the Latins to corrupt their books, but it was of the Greeks.

But you will object: if the Creed with the word "Filioque" was accepted at this Council, why is it that St. John Damascene, who lived at the time of the Council, so openly denied that the Spirit proceeds from the Son in book 1, chapter 11 of his treatise on Faith. I respond that it is probable that Damascene died before the Seventh Council; for, he was active especially at the time of Leo III, as is clear from his Oration 2 on the cult of images, and the Synod was held 48 years after the death of Leo. Hence in his works he does not cite the Councils, except those up to the Sixth one. Then even if perhaps he was living at the time of the Seventh Council, still doubtless he had written those books on Faith earlier, as is clearly gathered from session 6 of the Council of Nicaea II.

Now besides those Greek Councils, many were also held by the Latins. And first of all, the Council of Bari was celebrated by the Greeks together with the Latins during the time of Urban II, not long after the beginning of the schism, about the year 1090. in which Anselm convinced the Greeks with very persuasive reasons. Anselm himself mentions this Council in chapter 4 of his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit, and the author of the life of Anselm, who was present at the same Council, in book 2 narrates this whole matter at great length.

Secondly, there is Lateran Council IV under Innocent III in the year 1215, where also in chapter 1 it was defined that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and from the Son; Greeks were present at that Council, and agreed with it, as is clear from chapter 4 of the same Council.

Thirdly, there is the Council of Lyons II under Gregory X in the year 1273, where the Greeks were present, and with the consent of all the Creed was sung with the addition of the "Filioque" three times in Greek, three times in Latin. The definition of this Council is given in the sixth decree, title 1, chapter 1.

Fourthly, there is the Council of Florence in the year 1438, where again the same thing is defined after long debates, with the agreement of both Greeks and Latins.

In addition there are the Councils of Toledo I, chapter 21, III chapter 1, IV chapter 1, VIII chapter 1 and XI chapter 1; all of these were celebrated before the dissent of the Greeks, that is, before the year of our Lord 700. From these Councils not only the decision of the Church is apparent, but also the pertinacity and inconstancy of the Greeks, who, having been defeated so many times in the debates, always returned to their vomit

CHAPTER XXIV

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE LATIN FATHERS

Now we will bring forth the testimonies of the Latin Fathers, who were outstanding in doctrine and holiness before the schism and controversy with the Greeks. It is a sign of great temerity to refuse to accept their testimony, both because there is no reason why the Greeks should be accepted but not the Latins, if they are of the same antiquity, erudition and holiness; and also because we see that the Council of Ephesus, in order to prove church dogma, quotes both Latins and Greeks, namely, Feliz, Julius, Cyprian, Ambrose, among the Latins, and Basil, Nyssa, Nazianzen, Athanasius, among the Greeks. Vincent of Lérins bears witness to this at the end of his short work on the subject. Likewise, it is certain that the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Councils also cited the testimonies of the Greeks and the Latins; the same was also done by Basil in chapter 29 of his book on the Holy Spirit and Augustine in books 1 and 2 against Julian. Both of them present testimonies from the Greeks and from the Latins.

Therefore, who are these new Greeks who disregard the holy Latin Fathers, even though they are very ancient and respected? Do they not see that with this reasoning they are accusing the ancient Church of heresy? Or rather that they are teaching that the Greeks were never joined together with the Latins? But certainly the acts of the seven General Councils give their testimony, since we see there the greatest harmony between the Latins and the Greeks. But these new teachers have departed considerably not only from the teaching, but also from the morals of the old Church.

Therefore the first Father from the Latins is Tertullian, who in chapter 4 of his book against Praxeas said: *I think the Spirit is from no other source but from the Father through the Son.* The Greeks respond to this text that they do not deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds *through* the Son, but *from* the Son. For, as Bessarion teaches at the end of his dogmatic Oration, the Greeks admit the expression "through the Son," but they explain it in three ways. First, that "through the Son" is added to denote the relation to the Father. Second, to denote the consubstantiality of the Father and of the Son. Third, because "through" is wont to be accepted for "with," and to prove this they cite some unknown poet.

But the first and second evasions are not convincing; for, in the same way one could say that the Son proceeds from the Spirator through the Holy Spirit. For in this way we would signify the relation of the Father as spirator to the Holy Spirit and the consubstantiality of the Father and of the Holy Spirit. Then why is it necessary that, since the Spirit is said to proceed from the Father, at the same time the relation of the Father to the Son is be indicated, or the consubsantiality of the Father and of the Son? The third reason is also not sufficient. First, because the same absurd conclusion would follow, namely, that it could be said that the Son proceeds from the Father through the Spirit. Second, because whatever may be the case with that unknown ροβζ in the Scriptures and in the Fathers, indeed also in the common way of speaking "through" signifies a cause, and it is also often used for "from," as Basil says in chapter 5 of his book on the Holy

Spirit. For we read in Gen. 4:1:7 *have gotten a man through the help of the Lord,* that is, *from the Lord.* Likewise in John 1:2: *All things were made through him.* And in Col.l:16: *All things were created through him.* And in Heb. 1:2: *Through whom also he created the world.* For if in these places "through" signified "with," the meaning would be that the Son was made or created by God together with creatures. Certainly not even the Greeks will admit that, unless to act foolishly with the Arians rather than to think correctly with the Catholic Church. Therefore it is clear that the Spirit is produced; according to the Scriptures there is nothing other than that he is proceeds and is produced by the Son or from the Son. But let us move on to other witnesses.

II. There is St. Cyprian, who in his sermon on the coming of the Holy Spirit said: *The Holy Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son hovers over the four elements, and the kindly creator embraces his own work, etc.* Here he is speaking about the Holy Spirit, when at the beginning of the world he moved over the waters, and formed the four elements.

III. St. Hilary in book 2 on the Trinity says this: *Concerning the Holy Spirit I ought not to be silent, and yet I have no need to speak; still, for the sake of those who are in ignorance, I cannot refrain. There is no need to speak, because we are bound to confess Him, proceeding, as He does, from Father and Son. For my own part, I think it wrong to discuss the question of His existence.*

IV. St. Ambrose, whom the Greeks certainly ought not to reject, since in the third General Council they know that he was cited as a holy Doctor, in book 2, chapter 12 of his book on the Holy Spirit said: *The Son received all things from the Father, for He Himself said: All things have been delivered unto Me from My Father. All that is the Father's the Son also has, for He says again: All things which the Father has are Mine. And those things which He Himself received by Unity of nature, the Spirit by the same Unity of nature received also from Him, as the Lord Jesus Himself declares, when speaking of His Spirit: Therefore said I, He shall receive of Mine.*

V. St. Jerome in number 9 of his letter to Hedibia said: *When the Holy Spirit is sent, he is sent by the Father and the Son, to this place or to that place, and he is called the Spirit of God the Father and the Spirit of Christ.* And in his comments on Isa. 57 he said: *The Spirit goes forth from the Father, and because of the association of nature he is sent by the Son.*

VI. Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed said: *The Holy Spirit, proceeding from both, and sanctifying all.*

VII. Augustine in tractate 99 on John said: *Someone may here inquire whether the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son.* And after that: *Why do we not believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds also from the Son, since he is the Spirit of the Son?* See also book 15, chapters 17,26,27 on the Trinity and book 3, chapter 14 against Maximinus.

VIII. St. Prosper in book 1, chapter 18 on the contemplative life, concerning the Holy Spirit said: *He proceeds from the Father and the Son.*

IX. St. Leo in chapter 1 of his letter to Turbius said: *There is one who begets, another who is begotten, and a third who proceeds from both.* And this is the great Leo, whom the Fourth Council with 630 Bishops, almost all of whom were from the East, extolled

with great praise in various actions; and with reference to him they repeated—what Leo believes that is what we believe.

X. St. Fulgentius in chapter 2 of his book on Faith for Peter said: *It pertains to the Holy Spirit that he was not born, but he alone proceeds from the Father and the Son.*

XI. Idacius Clarus towards the middle of his book against Varimadus said: *If they say to you: show us from where the Holy Spirit takes his origin, answer them like this: the certain and manifest origin of the Holy Spirit is the Father and the Son.*

XII. Boethius in book 1, chapter 12 on the Trinity wrote: *We must think thus—that the Son is from the Father and the Holy Spirit is from both, etc.*

XIII. Pope Hormisdas in chapter 2 of his letter to Emperor Justinian said: *It is proper to the Holy Spirit that he proceeds from the Father and the Son, in one substance of the Godhead.*

XIV. Pope St. Gregory published a Creed, which is recorded in his life in book 2, chapter 2 and it says this: *I believe in the Holy Spirit, neither begotten nor unbegotten, but proceeding eternally from the Father and the Son.* The same Gregory in book 2, last chapter of his Dialogues says: *the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.*

XV. The last of the Latins is the venerable Bede. For I decided to cite only those who were living before the beginning of the schism. Therefore, Bede says this in book 1 on the elements of Philosophy: *The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.* Likewise in the collected works of St. Augustine on the letters of St. Paul, on the text in Gal. 4:6: *He sent the Spirit of his Son,* he presents a lengthy disputation of Augustine, whereby it is proved that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. But now let us consider the Greeks.

CHAPTER XXV

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE GREEK FATHERS

The first of the Greeks to consider is St. Gregory Thaumaturgus, who, in the divinely accepted profession of Faith, which is found in the works of Gregory of Nyssa in his life of this Gregory, says the following: *There is one Holy Spirit who has his origin and existence from God, and who appeared through the Son, the perfect image of the Son.* In this place it is not necessary to raise a question about the word "through" nor about the verb "appeared," because above we have already shown that the word "through" signifies a cause, or a productive principle, and because the Son sent the Holy Spirit to creatures, it can obviously be deduced that the Holy Spirit also proceeds eternally from the Son.

However, the expression "image of the Son" should be carefully noted; for, although the Holy Spirit is not so properly the image of the Son, as the Son is the image of the Father, because he does not proceed in virtue of a similitude, nevertheless he could in no way be said to be the image of the Son, unless he proceeded from him, and were similar to him in essence. For the word "image" says the relation of a product to the producer, and without this relation no similitude suffices. Hence it is not said, a brother is the image of his brother, even if he is similar to him; and one egg is not the image of another egg, although because of the similitude, one can hardly be discerned from the other. For a similitude is not sufficient, but it is required that one proceed from the other, and this is a relation that is not found in eggs and brothers. Since, therefore, St. Gregory said that the Holy Spirit is the image of the Son, without doubt he thought that he truly proceeds from the Son.

You will say: it is not required that the exemplar be the active cause of the image, but it is sufficient if it is the exemplar, as happens in making statues. I respond: in artificial things the exemplar is not the active cause, but it is in natural productions. That is so, since it necessarily coincides with the active principle, as is evident in all things. For, all things that act naturally produce their effects in a similitude to the proper form; therefore, since the Holy Spirit is produced not freely but naturally, the active principle is the same and is the exemplar with respect to it.

The second Greek to consider is St. Athanasius, who in the Creed says this: *The Holy Spirit is not made by the Father and the Son, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding from them.*

Regarding this testimony two things can be said. First, that this Creed is not truly from Athanasius. But this is easily refuted, both from Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration in praise of Athanasius, where he says that he composed a perfect confession of Faith, which the whole East and West venerates, and also from Augustine who, when citing by name Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria in his comments on Ps. 121, quotes the whole verse of this Creed, and without the name of Athanasius uses whole sentences of the Creed, as being well known in the Church; he does this in book 5, chapter 8 on the Trinity, in letter 174 to Pascentius, in chapter 36 of the Enchiridion, and in Sermon 295 on time.

Secondly, it could be said that these words "and from the Son" were added by the

Latins. But this cannot be said, both because these words are also found in the Greek Creeds, and also in the Council of Toledo IV, chapter 1, a confession is recited that is taken almost verbally from this Creed; there we read "from the Father and the Son," and this Council was held about the year 633 and therefore before the schism of the Greeks. You can add to this that Gennadius Scholarius in his book defending the Council of Florence, chapter 1, section 5, says that the Greeks of his time were accustomed to say that Athanasius was drunk when he composed this Creed. From this it is apparent that they did not deny that Athanasius wrote it.

The second place in the works of Athanasius is in Sermon 4 against the Arians, some distance before the middle on page 233: *For we are not introducing,* he said, *three principles, or three Fathers, like the Marcionists, since we are not proclaiming three Suns for a comparison, but only one Sun, and his splendor, and the unique light from both of them.* Here you see clearly that there are three—the Sun, the splendor, and the light proceeding from both of them. I think it cannot be doubted that Athanasius understood by the Sun the Father, by the splendor the Son, by the light the Holy Spirit. What, I ask, can be the response to this?

The third place in the works of Athanasius is near the end of the book addressed to Redargutus: *But it is impossible for the Holy Spirit to be numbered in the glory of the Trinity, if he did not emanate from God through the Son, but was made by God by way of a creature, as they think.* Note that Athanasius did not say "from the Father through the Son," lest the more recent Greeks should say that the Son is added to signify a relation; but note that he said "from God through the Son." These words cannot refer to a mission to creatures, since this emanation is opposed to creation.

The fourth place is in the long letter to Serapion, where he proves against the Macedonians that it cannot in any way be defended that the Holy Spirit is a creature, if the Son is not a creature. And this is the argument of the whole letter.

But he proves the same thing with this reason, which he proposes in almost the whole letter in various ways. For there is the same order and union between the Holy Spirit and the Son, as there is between the Father and the Son. But the Son, because he is from God the Father, is God like the Father; therefore similarly the Holy Spirit, who is from God the Son, will be God like the Son. Or, if he is not God, then the Son will not be God, and neither will the Father be God. *Since, therefore,* he said near the middle of the letter, *the Spirit has an order and nature to the Son of this kind, such as the Son has to the Father, how can it be but that anyone who says the Spirit is a creature, does not necessarily say the same thing about the Son? For if the Spirit is a creature of the Son, the result is that they must say that the Word also is a creature of the Father.* These are his words. Here Athanasius believes it is so certain that the Holy Spirit is produced by the Son, that accordingly he concludes as from a firm and well-known principle what had been raised as a doubt, namely, that the Holy Spirit is God.

They can respond that the order of the Spirit to the Son, and of the Son to the Father consists only in this—that just as the Father sends the Son to creatures, so the Son sends the Spirit. But this cannot be said unless with a mission to creatures we understand a true procession as to the essence, otherwise the argument of Athanasius would have no value,

just as this argument has no value: God sends the angels. Therefore either the angels are not creatures, or God is a creature. But this is not valid, because the angels are so sent by God to creatures, that that mission does not include an eternal procession of angels from the substance of God. If therefore the Holy Spirit is sent by the Son to creatures, and he does not proceed substantially from the Son himself as from the Father, certainly he is not sent any way differently than the angels are sent; and therefore it cannot be deduced from that that he is God, or that the Son is not God, which however is what Athanasius concludes. Then if Athanasius were to speak about the mission to creatures, he would not say: *For if the Spirit is a creature of the Son, etc.,* because those words signify a production, not a mission. And Athanasius contends that the Holy Spirit is produced by the Son, but that he is not created from nothing.

Furthermore, after one page Athanasius said: *But he is also the image of the Son, and is called Spirit.* And after that: *But if he is the Son, because he is from God the Father, it is proper to his substance; it is also necessary that the Spirit, because he is said to be from God, to be proper to the Son according to substance.* Surely when Athanasius says that the Spirit is from God, he understands it as from God the Son, otherwise he would not draw his conclusion correctly. Therefore he concludes that he is proper to the Son, just as the Son is proper to the Father, because he is from the Father. There are also two shorter letters to the same Serapion in which he says the same thing in other words.

The third Greek Father is St. Basil, whom indeed the Greeks place before almost all of the others. He, therefore, near the end of book 2 on Eunomius said: *But that is quite obscure—that no operation of the Son is cut off from the Father, nor is it in the nature of things that something is present to the Son and separated from the Father. For, he said, all my things are yours, and yours are mine. How, therefore, can the Spirit attribute his cause to the only-begotten alone?*

And the Greek words in no way disagree with this, for this is what he says: Πώςούν τού πνεύματος την αιτίαν τώ μονογενεϊ μονω προστίθησι; certainly while Basil is proving not only that the Son is the cause of the Holy Spirit, but also the Father, because the Father has everything that the Son has, at the same time he is teaching, and in fact assumes as certain, that the cause of the Spirit, as the Greeks say, is the Son. And that cause cannot be referred to the gifts of the Holy Spirit, for Basil is writing against Eunomius, who was not disputing about the gifts, but about the substance of the Holy Spirit, and he wanted the Son alone to be the cause of the Holy Spirit.

Another place is near the beginning of Basil's book against Eunomius: *Why is it necessary,* he said, *if the Spirit is third in dignity and order, that he is also third in nature? For in dignity he is second from the Son, since he has his being from him, and he depends completely on that cause; the nature of piety hands on that he is third in nature, but we have not learned from the Holy Scriptures, and it is not possible to deduce this from the prophecies.*

In the 20th session at the Council of Florence the Greeks said that this text has been corrupted and is not present in all the Greek codices, but only in some. And truly in the Greek text of Basil published in 1551 it reads like this: άξιώματι μεν γαρ δευτερεύεινχον ύιου παραδίδωσιν ό της ένσεβείος λόγος etc., but the words are lacking: *Since he has his*

being from him, and he depends completely on that cause, in which the whole force of this reasoning is placed. However, the Latins responded that the Greek codex had been corrupted by them, and they presented a very old codex written before the six hundreds, where all the words we have quoted were present.

Moreover, from what follows we conclude clearly, either that those words should be in the text, or certainly their meaning. For, Basil goes on to say the following: *For as the Son is second in order from the Father, since he is from him; and in dignity, since the Father for him is origin and cause of his being, but by nature in no way is he second, because there is one Godhead in both, so also the Holy Spirit, although in dignity and order he is second from the Son, it does not follow from that that he is of a different nature.* And all of this is present in the Greek word for word. Ponder, I beseech you, the reasoning of Basil. He says that the Spirit is second from the Son in order and dignity, but not in nature. And he proves it, because just as the Son is second from the Father, because he has his being from him, so also the Spirit is second from the Son, where, unless that is added or understood, which is in our codices, namely, that the Spirit has his being from the Son just as the Son has his being from the Father, the reasoning of Basil does not conclude anything, nor can it in any way be proved that the Holy Spirit is second from the Son, as the Son is second from the Father.

The third place is in book 5, chapter 8 against Eunomius and that the Holy Spirit is the true and natural image of God and of Christ. For this title: ότι είκων αληθής και φυσική Θεού και Κριστοῦ το πνεύμα indicates sufficiently that the Holy Spirit has his being from the Father and the Son. For, as we said above, that is not a true and natural image which is not produced from the exemplar itself.

The fourth place is in chapter 11 of the same book, where we read this in the title of the chapter: ότι ώς ύιος προς πατέρα έχει ούτως πνεύμα προς ύιον, that is: *as the Son is related to the Father, so also the Spirit is related to the Son.* And immediately he adds this: Διά τοῦτο και Θεού μεν λόγος ό ύιος, ρήμα δε ύιοῦ το Πνεύμα, that is: *Therefore the Word of God is the Son, but the Word of the Son is the Spirit.* Those are his words. But how can the Spirit be said to be the Word of the Son, if he does not proceed from him? And how is the Spirit related to the Son in the same way as the Son is related to the Father, if the Son indeed proceeds from the Father, but the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son?

The fifth place is in chapter 12 of the same book, where this question is proposed: Δια τί μή και το πνεύμα ύιος τού ύιού; *Why is the Spirit not the Son of the Son?* And Basil responds: ότι ού διά το μή είναι έκ Θεού δί ύιού άλλ' ίνα ή τριάς μή νομισθή πλήθος άπειρον, etc., that is: *Therefore he is not said to be the Son of the Son, not because he is not from God through the Son, but lest we be suspected of multiplying the Trinity to infinity.* For, if the Spirit were said to be the Son of the Son, the result would seem to be that he also would have another son, and so one after another.

A few observations should be made here. The first one is that the title of the question is an argument for our thesis; for, if the Spirit were from the Father alone, certainly the question would not be asked why he is not the Son of the Son, just as no one asks why a brother is not called the son of his brother, since the matter is so obvious that there cannot be any question about the source of his birth. Since therefore a serious question has been

raised why the Spirit is not said to be the Son of the Son, this is a sign that it is well known among all that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.

Note secondly that this question was taken very seriously by both Basil and Athanasius in the letters addressed to Serapion; for both seem to have suffered great anguish over this, and this in itself is a strong argument for our thesis. For, they could have said with a single word: he is not called the Son, because he is not from him, however they never did say that, but they did say that this is an inscrutable mystery, and it should be enough for us in this matter to know that he is, and we should not seek to know why and how, etc.

Note thirdly that the response of Basil "it is not because he is not from God through the Son" is also an argument for our thesis. For, if that "through" did not signify a cause, but it were used in place of "with," as the Greeks want it to be, Basil would have said nothing. For, if the Spirit were from God through the Son, that is, with the Son, no one could have suspected that he is the Son of the Son, but rather they would suspect that he has to be the brother of the Son.

Note finally that the response of Basil has this meaning, namely, that the Spirit is from the Son, however by a kind of production that is not generation; therefore he is not said to be the Son, etc.

The sixth place is in chapter 17 of the book on the Holy Spirit, where Basil says this: ὡς τοίνυν ἔχει ὁ ὑιος προς πατέρα οὑτω προς ὑιον το πνεύμα, that is: *As the Son is related to the Father, so the Spirit is related to the Son.* Those are his words. But what is that relation between the Father and the Son, except that of a producer to what is produced? For the Father and the Son are the same, except that the Son is from the Father, not the Father from the Son. Therefore between the Holy Spirit there is only this distinction that the Holy Spirit is from the Son and the Son is not from the Holy Spirit.

The fourth Greek is Gregory of Nyssa, because he provides us with three testimonies. Gennadius cites one of them in chapter 1 of his defense of the Council of Florence, taken from homily 4 on the Lord's Prayer: *The Holy Spirit is said to be from the Father, and he is also shown to be from the Son, etc.* But Gennadius says that this text was removed by the Greeks from many codices, and it is actually not found in the copies that now exist.

Bessarion quotes another testimony in chapter 6 of his Oration from book 1 of Gregoiy against Eunomius, but these books are not yet available in Latin: *The Spirit is joined to the Father,* he said, *inasmuch as both are uncreated. He is distinguished from the Father, because he is not the Father; but he is also joined to the Son inasmuch as both are uncreated, and inasmuch as both have their substance from the first principle. He is distinguished by his property, which is this: he was not produced from the Father as the only-begotten, and he was manifested through the Son himself.* Those are his words. There you should note first of all that the "through" cannot be accepted for "with," because the Spirit, inasmuch as he proceeds with the Son from the Father, is not distinguished from the Son, but is joined together with him, but here we are concerned about the distinction. Note secondly that the word "manifested" cannot be accepted for the pouring out alone of temporal gifts; for, here we are dealing with the distinction of the persons. But the persons were distinguished by their own properties before any external mission of the Holy Spirit

The third testimony is found near the end in the book to Ablabius that there are not

three Gods, where, since Gregory taught that there is only one simple nature of God, he then adds that therefore the persons should not be confused, but distinguished because one is from another: *We do not deny the difference in respect of cause, and that which is caused, by which alone* we *apprehend that one Person is distinguished from another—by our belief that is, that one is the Cause, and another is of the Cause; and again in that which is of the Cause we recognize another distinction. For one is directly from the first Cause, and another by that which is directly from the first Cause.*

Note first of all, from those first words "by which alone," that it is evidently concluded that the Son is the cause or principle of the Holy Spirit. For, Gregory is saying that the three persons are discerned only by this—that one is the cause of another. Hence it follows: if the Son is not the cause of the Holy Spirit, the Son and the Holy Spirit are not distinguished. For the Greeks were not going to say that the Holy Spirit is the cause of the Son; but neither were they going to say that the Spirit is not distinguished from the Son, lest they worship a Duality in place of the Trinity; therefore they are forced to confess, if they have faith in Gregory, that the Son is the cause of the Holy Spirit.

Note secondly that in the words *"one is the Cause, and another is of the Cause; and again in that which is of the Cause* the three properties of the three persons are referred to. For, the Father is the Cause, the Son is of the Cause, the Holy Spirit is that which is of the Cause, that is, from the Son.

Note thirdly that in the words "and another" something different that is specifically diverse from what went before is not being proposed, for then Gregory would be in conflict with himself, since he had said that the persons are distinguished by this alone, namely, that one is the cause of another. But he calls it another difference because it is proposed in another way: it is this—that the Son is immediately from the Father alone, but the Spirit is immediately from the Father and immediately from the Son; but this is to be understood in a rational way. For, the Spirit is from the Father mediately and immediately, mediately inasmuch as the Father produces the Spirit not only through the Son, but also through himself. Therefore, the difference consists in this—that the Son in no way is from the Father mediately, but only immediately; but the Spirit in some way is from the Father mediately.

The fifth Greek is Gregoiy Nazianzen, who in Oration 5 on Theology says this: τί ούν έστί φησίν, ό λείπει τώ πνεΰματι προς το είδε ύιον είγαρ μή λειπόν τι ήν ύιος άν ού λείπειν φαμεν δε γαρ έλλειπής Θεός, το δε τής εκφανεσεως ίν' ούτως έπω, ή τής προς άλληλα σχέσεως διάφορον, αύτων και τήν κλήσιν πεποίηκεν. With these words he is asking what is lacking in the Holy Spirit so that he is not a son. He responds: *We say that he is lacking nothing; for nothing is lacking in God; but there is the manifestation, so to speak, of the difference of their mutual relation, and he also provided different names for them, etc.* In this place Gregoiy states the reason why the Spirit is not called the Son, because they have different, in fact opposite and mutual relations. But certainly there cannot be mutual relations between the Son and the Holy Spirit, unless it is because one spirates and the other is spirated. For the Son as Son is not relative to the Holy Spirit, but the Son as spirator is referred to the Holy Spirit. And it cannot be responded that the Son and the Holy Spirit are distinguished by different relations with respect to the Father, not with

respect to each other; for, Gregory clearly said that the Spirit is not the Son, that is, that he is distinct from the Son because of the relation they have to each other, that is, because of the mutual relation.

Moreover, a little further on he writes: in the same way there is nothing lacking in the Son why he is not the Father, and still he is not the Father, because they have opposite relations. And even further on he gives the example of Adam, Eve and Seth, of whom Adam is from no man, Eve is from the man alone, and Seth is from both: ὁΑδάμ τίποτε ἦν; πλάσμα Θεού. τί δε ἡ Ευα; τμήμα του πλάσματος, τί δε ὁ Σήθ; ἀμφοτέρων γέννημα. *What,* he said, *was Adam? The image of God. What was Eve? A part of the image. What was Seth? The offspring from both.* Therefore, since Gregory compared the three divine persons to these three human beings, who does not see from this idea of Gregory that the Son is from the Father, but the Spirit from the Father and the Son?

The sixth Greek is Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechism at 7, before the middle: *Then is only one,* he said, *and the same Holy Spirit coming and subsisting, who everywhere is present with the Father and the Son; he is not formed by the speaking mouth and lips of the Father and the Son, or breathed forth, or diffused in the air, but he is substantial, speaking himself and operating, etc.* There Cyril would not say that he was not formed in a bodily way from the mouth of the Father and the Son, unless he believed that he was spiraled by the Father and the Son; for it was enough to say that he was not formed by the mouth of the Father. Therefore Cyril is saying that the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and of the Son, and that he proceeds from both, but in a spiritual and ineffable way.

The seventh is John Chrysostom in tome 5, homily 1 on the Creed: *This is the Spirit,* he *said, proceeding from the Father and the Son, who distributes his gifts to each one as he wills.* And in homily 2: *We say that the Holy Spirit is co-equal to the Father and the Son, and that he proceeds from the Father and the Son.* And in homily 76 on John he said: *Behold, not the Father alone but also the Son sends the Spirit.* And lest the Greeks should say that Chrysostom is speaking about the temporal mission of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, the same Chrysostom in homily 77 explains why the Spirit is said to be sent by the Son: *Moreover, he shows the difference of the persons when he places two, etc.* Therefore, if the mission is expressed to signify the distinction of the persons, really the person himself is sent, not just the gifts; and since the distinction of the persons is eternal, it is necessaiy that this mission includes the eternal emanation. Finally, Gennadius in his apology for the Latins, in chapter 1 § 4 quotes another text of Chrysostom from his homily on the Incarnation with these words: *Christ came to us, he gave us the Spirit descending from himself, and he assumed our body.*

The eighth is Epiphanius in Heresies 69 which is about the Arians on page 219: Bur *the Holy Spirit should not be compared to other spirits, because there is one Spirit of God the Spirit proceeding from the Father and receiving from the Son, but these men wart him to be the creature of a creature, etc.* In this text the expression "receiving from the Son" can signify nothing but that he proceeds from the Son by an eternal emanation. For. Epiphanius contrasts that "receiving from the Son" with a creation; for, he teaches that the Spirit was not created by the Son, as the heretics said, but accepted his subsistence in a way that is different from creation. Hence a little later he says: *And just as the Son is not*

foreign to the Father, but begotten from him, the Holy Spirit is also not foreign. Indeed the Son is the only-begotten, the Father is without a principle, without time, but the Holy Spirit is neither begotten, nor created, but proceeding from the Father, and receiving from the Son. And on page 223: *Everything was created by God, but the Son of God alone is begotten, and the Spirit alone proceeds from the Father, and receives from the Son. But all other things were created, and they did not go forth from the Father by some kind of increase, nor did they receive from the Son.* And on page 229 he said: *In this way he shows that he is a fount from a fount, that the Holy Spirit is from the Father and from the Only-begotten.*

Likewise in Anchora on page 332: *The Spirit of God, both the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son not according to some composition, as in us the soul and the body, but in the middle of the Father and the Son from the Father, and a third Son by nomenclature.* On page 349: *But if Christ is believed from the Father to be God from God, also the Spirit is from Christ, or from both.* On page 350: *The Son,* he said, *is life from life, but the Holy Spirit is from both.* On page 351 : *He calls him Son,* he said, *who is from the Father, but the Holy Spirit is from both.* And after that: *Hear, O good man, that the Father of the true Son is the Father of total light, and the Son of the true Father is light from light, not like something made or a creature in name only; and the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of truth, the third light from the Father and the Son.* And after that: *The Holy Spirit from the Father and from the Son is the only light of truth.*

The ninth is Dydimus of Alexandria in book 2, near the middle, of his work on the Holy Spirit: *He does not speak,* he said, *from himself, that is, not without my and the Father's approval, because he is inseparable from mine and the Father's will, because he is not from himself, but he is from the Father and from me. The fact that he subsists and speaks he has from the Father and from me.* And after that: *The Holy Spirit,* he said, *who is the Spirit of truth, and the Spirit of wisdom, when the Son is speaking cannot hear what he does not know, since this is what is uttered by the Son, that is, proceeding from the truth, the Consoler proceeding from the Consoler.* And on the following page he said: *There is no other substance of the Holy Spirit, except what is given to him by the Son.*

The tenth is Cyril of Alexandria in book 11 on John 1. *But,* he said, *since he is consubstantial with the Son, and proceeds through him, having all his power, therefore he speaks because he will receive what is mine.* And after that: *For since he proceeds naturally through the Son, so that he has everything that the Son has absolutely, he is said to receive what belongs to him.*

Note that the Spirit proceeds through the Son with everything that he has absolutely. Then what can that mean but that the divine essence, and all the absolute perfections, are communicated to the Holy Spirit through procession from the Son? And in chapter 25 he said: *He came forth from the substance itself of God the Father, but was poured out on the Saints by the consubstantial Word, from whom he is according to his possession of being and subsistence.* Could St. Cyril have said more clearly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son? For we understand that through procession from the Son that the Holy Spirit has being and subsistence from the Son, which Cyril states in clear words. Likewise in book 12, chapter 56 in his comments on John he said: *He proceeds from the Father through*

the Son. Similarly in book 13, chapter 2 of his Thesaurus he said: *And therefore he also calls the Holy Spirit Lord, as being from the Son and naturally existing in him.* And after that: *Thus* we *understand that the Son of God naturally is from and in the Father himself. However, we believe that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son naturally, and essentially as he is from the Father.* Likewise in the book on the right Faith to Theodotus, near the middle. And books 5,6 and 7 on the Trinity have similar statements. Finally, on Joel 2 (as cited by Bessarion in chapter 7 of his Oration): *It is proper to him,* he said, *that the Spirit is in him and from him, just as he is understood to be from God the Father.*

XI. Simeon Metaphrastes, of whom there is honorable mention in the Council of Florence, in his life of St. Dionysius the Areopagite said: *My Christ ascended into heaven, where he is seated at the right hand of the Father, and he is sending the Spirit, who proceeds from him, to his disciples.*

XII. Anastasius, who is mentioned with great honor at the Sixth Council, in book 1 on the right dogmas says this: *The Holy Spirit is called the Spirit of the mouth of God; for he is the mouth of the Father and the Son.* Those are his words. There he says in a sufficiently clear way that the Holy Spirit thus proceeds from the Son, who is called the mouth of God, just as the spirit of our mouth is breathed forth by our mouth. Then he says after that: *So that he might teach that there is one essence both of him who receives, and of him from whom he receives, and also of him from whom he proceeds.* Those are his words. There, by him who receives the essence, he understands the Spirit, by him from whom he receives it, he understands the Son, by him from whom he proceeds the Father. But if the Spirit receives his essence from the Son, what more do we need? For, the question should not be about the word "proceeds," since there is certainty about this matter. Hence in the same place he adds this: *For he does not come forth from that which is a foreign essence, nor does he receive anything from things not consubstantial with himself.* And after that he said: *Again the Spirit himself proceeds from him and is sent by him, not by the Father alone, but also by the Son.* And finally: *Indeed the Lord, declaring that the Holy Spirit comes forth from himself, breathing on the disciples said: Receive the Holy Spirit.*

XIII. Tharsius in a letter to the Patriarch of the East, which is contained in the acts of the Seventh Council, said: *We believe in the Holy Spirit, who proceeds from the Father through the Son.*

XIV. Maximus, a learned and holy man, in his commentary on Zech. 4, said: Just *as the Holy Spirit is according to his essence of God and the Father, so he is of the Son according to his essence, as proceeding from the Father essentially, and through the Son bom ineffably.* Bessarion in chapter 6 quotes this passage.

XV. Finally, there is John Damascene in book 1, chapter 18 of his treatise on Faith. *The Son is the image of the Father,* he said, *and the Holy Spirit of the Son;* but certainly an image has its being from the exemplar. And after that: *God the Holy Spirit is the middle between the unbegotten and the begotten, and through the Son he is joined to the Father* Therefore we have fifteen Latin witnesses, and fifteen Greek, who clearly taught, before the appearance of our division, that the Holy Spirit is produced by the Father and the Son, and is spiraled, so that now the intolerable obstinacy of the Greeks should clearly bi evident.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED ALSO BY REASON

Consult the many reasons given by St. Thomas in book 4, chapter 24 of his *Contra Gentiles* and in De Pot. q. 10, a. 4. The main reason of St. Thomas is this: If the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, he would not be distinguished from him. But this is against the Faith, because then there would be a Duality, not a Trinity. Therefore, the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son.

The force of the argument is proved as follows. Every distinction in God is derived from the relation of origin; but if the Spirit did not proceed from the Son, there would not be between them a relation of origin; therefore if the Spirit did not proceed from the Son, he would not be distinguished from the Son. The force of this argument is proved again. For there is nothing in God except essence and relation, either absolute or relative. But the essence and all absolutes are common; therefore only what is relative distinguishes. Therefore in chapter 11 of the Council of Toledo XI it is said that number is perceived in the relations alone; therefore every distinction takes it origin from the relations. For where there is no distinction, there cannot be any numbering. Moreover, if all the absolutes were not common to the three persons, the three persons would not be one, as the Lateran Council teaches in chapter 4. Likewise, we would not be able to defend the simplicity of God, nor could we show that there is no perfection in one person, which is not in another Therefore there should be no doubt that relation alone distinguishes the Trinity.

Again. Not just any relation suffices to make a distinction. For, relations that are not opposite do not distinguish, as is clear, because in the one Father there are two relations, paternity and active spiration, and nevertheless they do not distinguish two persons. Therefore it must be opposite relations that distinguish.

Again. Not just any opposite relations distinguish, but they must be real relations. For, a relation of identity says opposition, but it does not distinguish, because it does not say a *real* opposition. Again, opposite relations, and real ones, are founded either on quantity as equality, or on quality as a similitude, or on an action like paternity, and filiation. But in God there are no real relations based on quantity or on quality; therefore only relations based on action remain, which are called relations of origin and which can distinguish persons.

The assumption is proved. For, in God there is indeed equality and similitude, but because the foundation of all of these is the essence alone, which is only one numerically, therefore those relations are logical or relations of reason, not real relations. For there cannot be real relations where there are no proximate foundations really distinct. And even if equality and similitude in God were real relations, as Scotus says they are, nevertheless a distinction of persons could not be concluded from that. For, Scotus thinks that in order to have real relations distinct foundations are not required, but that distinct subject of the relations suffices; and since the Father and the Son are real extremes, therefore he thinks that their equality and similitude are real relations.

Therefore according to this opinion they are not distinct persons, because they are

equal or similar with a real relation of equality or similitude; but on the contrary, they are therefore equal or similar with a real relation, because they are distinct persons. Therefore, only relations of origin are distinguished, and from that it follows, as has already been proven, that either the Holy Spirit takes his origin from the Son, and is referred to him by a relation of origin, which is to proceed from him, or certainly he is not distinguished from him, which not even the Greeks ever taught.

But contrary to this opinion there is a very troublesome objection. For, it does not seem to be true that only opposite relations are really distinguished in God. For, paternity; and passive spiration are really distinguished; and nevertheless they are not opposed; the situation is similar with filiation and passive spiration.

Some authors respond that paternity is distinguished from passive spiration, because it is identified with active spiration, which is opposed to passive. But on the contrary. For then active spiration could not be in the Son, because it is identified with paternity, which is opposed to filiation, and similarly the essence could not be in the Son or in the Holy Spirit, because it is identified with paternity, which is distinguished really from filiation and passive spiration.

Others respond that paternity and passive spiration are distinguished, because they are in distinct supposits. But this is also not sufficient; because active spiration is also in distinct supposits, in fact in the Father and the Son, and still it is one and the same in both. And is not the essence itself in three really distinct supposits, and nevertheless it is one and the same in all? And moreover those supposits, that is, the Father and the Holy Spirit are not opposed properly; therefore not every distinction arises from opposition.

Still others respond that paternity and passive spiration are opposed virtually, because paternity is based on the production of an idea, passive spiration on the production of love, which are opposite productions, since they include the relations of origin, for love is bom from knowledge. But on the contrary. For, love does not arise from knowledge effectively, since the intellect only proposes the object to the will. However, a real distinction is not necessarily to be placed between the object and the act, as is clear in God, where the essence is the object of knowledge and love, and is not distinguished from the knowledge and love.

Therefore I respond that paternity is not opposed to passive spiration, but still it is distinguished from it by reason of a certain opposed relation. For, it is to be observed, when two relations are opposed, that they are not only distinguished, but also because of them that the relative supposits themselves are distinguished. Therefore, not only are active and passive spiration distinguished, but also the spirator and the spirated are distinguished, and because those relatives are subsistent persons. Consequently, the constitutive properties of these persons are distinguished, otherwise one would be the other.

Therefore, since paternity is constitutive of the person spiraling, necessarily he is distinguished from the passive spiration, which is constitutive of the spirated person, otherwise the Holy Spirit would be proceeding from himself. For, he proceeds from the Father, and he himself would be the Father, if paternity and passive spiration were not distinguished. I say the same thing about filiation, which is distinguished from passive

spiration, because filiation constitutes the person of the Son, and therefore of the spirator, if the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. But passive spiration constitutes the person of the spiraled one; however, spirator and spirated are opposed. Therefore some things are distinguished in God, which are not opposed relatively; but the nature of a distinction is always some relative opposition, and if it is removed, no distinction remains.

You will say: if the Spirit did not proceed from the Father, but only from the Son, there would be no relative opposition between the Father and the Spirit, and still he would be distinguished from him. For otherwise the Spirit would be the Father, and so would produce his own author, that is, the Son. I respond that in no way can active spiration be taken away from the Father, unless it is also taken away from the Son; for, if the Son spirates the Holy Spirit, by that veiy fact the Father also spirates him, at least mediately, and thus mediately he is opposed to the Holy Spirit. But if active spiration is taken away from the Son, it is not necessarily taken away from the Father, but then the Son would not be distinguished from the Holy Spirit. But if we imagine that it is taken away from both, then the procession itself of the Holy Spirit is also taken away, and so the Holy Spirit himself.

There is another objection against our same reasoning. To be generated and to be spirated are two ways of producing that are clearly very different, and on them different relations are founded, even if they are in no way opposed, as is clear, because nothing can be produced twice, or be produced in two ways, which is plainly proved by example For, no one can beget a son by nature, and produce the same one by artistry, and bring it about that the son and the statue are the same, even if these are in no way opposed. There is also the authority of St. Anselm, who in chapter 1 of his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit says this: *Since it is not yet certain that the Holy Spirit is from him and proceeds; therefore he is not the Holy Spirit nor is the Son the Holy Spirit, because the Son by being born has his being from the Father; but the Holy Spirit has his being not by being born, but my proceeding.*

I respond: what is many and divided in creatures, in God is one and simple, provided that no opposition impedes it. Hence, if the Holy Spirit did not proceed actively from the Son, without doubt to be generated and to be spirated would not be two ways, but really only one, which however could be distinguished logically. For, as in God intellect and will are the same, to understand and to will, the Word and Love could also be the same, unless one truly proceeded from the other; and as it is not repugnant for one person that he be both speaking and loving, or Father and spirator, so it is not repugnant for one person that he be both Word and Love, Son and Holy Spirit.

In addition, there is also an example of this in creatures. To beget and to teach are quite different formally, and similarly the relations of Father and Son differ considerably from the relations of teacher and disciple. Nevertheless one and the same person can be father and teacher with respect to the same individual, who will be his son and disciple. But when we do not see this, as in the example of the son and the statue—that happens because of the multiplication and distinction of the matter, not because of the difference in the relations.

Therefore, the reason of St. Thomas is very solid, and derived from the fundamentals

of the Faith; moreover, it is the common teaching of the Fathers, which indeed Scotus does not mention. For, Nazianzen in Oration 5 on Theology acknowledges only a distinction because of relations of origin. Nyssa, at the end of his letter to Ablabius says that the persons in God are distinguished only through being the cause or of the cause, which is the same as the preceding opinion. Augustine in book 1, last chapter of his book on the Trinity, and also in chapter 12, said: *Relation alone multiplies the Trinity.* Anselm in chapter 2 of his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit says that everything is one where there is no opposition of relations. Richard in book 2 on the Trinity says that the distinction of the persons comes from the number of the producers, because one person produces and is not produced, another produces and is produced, the third is produced and does not produce.

Given these quotes, it is easy to respond to the text cited by Anselm. For Anselm in chapters 1 and 2 explains the things concerning which we agree with the Greeks; of these, one is that the Son is distinguished from the Holy Spirit, because one receives his existence by being born, the other by proceeding. But then he shows that these two ways cannot be distinct, unless the Holy Spirit is from the Son, because everything is one where there is no opposition of relation. Now what remains is to present briefly the arguments of the Greeks, and to refute them.

CHAPTER XXVII

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE GREEKS ARE ANSWERED

They take the first argument from these words of John 15:26: *When the Paraclete comes, whom I shall send to you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, who proceeds from the Father.* Since the Lord said so clearly that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and he did not add that he is from the Son, it seems temerarious to say that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son.

I respond with Augustine in book 3, chapter 14 against Maximinus that the Father alone is named, not to exclude the Son, but because the Father is the principal author of the Holy Spirit. For the Son has from the Father that he can spirate. However, that the Son is not excluded, even though he is not named, is proved first of all from other similar places. For, in Matt. 16:17 it is said: *Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven.* However, that revelation was made by all three persons. And about the Holy Spirit in John 14:26: *He will teach you all things;* nevertheless, the Father and the Son also teach us all things.

Secondly, when it is said, "He proceeds from the Father," it cannot be understood from the Father as the Father is formally, because then the Spirit would be a Son; therefore, it means "from the Father" as he has essence in common with the Son; therefore he proceeds also from the Son.

Thirdly, as Anselm keenly argues in his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit: If it were said that no one produces the Holy Spirit, except the Father alone, the Son would still not be excluded, as is clear from a similar statement, for, it is said in Matt. 11:27: *No one knows the Son except the Father,* and nevertheless the Son himself and the Holy Spirit, who are of the same nature, are not excluded from knowledge of the Son. And in the same place he adds: *No one know the Father except the Son and any one to whom the Son chooses to reveal him,* and nevertheless the Father and the Spirit are not excluded from knowledge of the Father, even if the Son reveals nothing to them. Therefore, in the same way if it were said: no one produces the Holy Spirit except the Father, the Son would not be excluded from the production. Therefore, much less is he excluded by the statement, "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father." For here there is no exclusion, no negation.

The Greeks take their second argument from the fact that at the Council of Ephesus the Creed of the Nestorians was read, and the book of Theodoretus against the anathemas of Cyril, and in both cases it is stated expressly that the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Son, and nevertheless the Council Fathers remained silent; therefore they seem to have approved it.

I respond first of all by turning the argument back on them. For, at the same Council of Ephesus, and afterwards at the fourth and fifth Councils the letter of Cyril with the anathemas against Nestorius was read. In that letter it is said that the Spirit has his being from the Son, and nevertheless the Fathers did not contradict it; therefore they approved it. Secondly, Theodoretus not only says that the Spirit does not proceed from the Son,

but also that he does not proceed through the Son, which however the Greeks surely do assert. Therefore, if the Council, by its silence, approved that the Spirit does not proceed from the Son, which seems to be against us, and also approved that he does not proceed through the Son—that is against themselves. I say finally that the Council of Ephesus, although it did not want at that time expressly to discuss this question, because it had convened for another purpose, nevertheless it did clearly express its opinion, since with full consensus it approved the whole teaching of Cyril, and condemned the contrary view of the Nestorians and Theodoretus. The same thing was done by the fourth and fifth Councils. Indeed, it was also done by the sixth and seventh Councils, and by all the following Councils.

They take their third argument from the Fathers, and first of all they cite Dionysius the Areopagite, who in chapter 2 of his Divine Names said: *The only supersubstantial fount of the Godhead is the Father.* I respond that that is true, because the Father does not have his divinity from anyone else. Hence some compare the Father to a fount, which gives and does not receive, the Son to a river, which receives and gives, the Holy Spirit to a lake, which receives and does not get its water from another. But although for this reason the Father is called the fount, because he does not receive from another source, still for another reason Epiphanius in Heresies 69 also calls the Son a fount, but a fount from a fount, like God from God, because he receives the same essence the Father has.

Secondly, they quote Basil, who said in letter 43: *The Son has no communion, according to its proper notion, with the Father.* Therefore he does not agree with the Father in spiration, which is a certain notion. Furthermore, he says in the same place, that the proper notion of the Holy Spirit is that he is known through the Son and with the Son, and he has his subsistence from the Father.

I respond to the first statement that Basil is not speaking about just any notion, but about a notion which is a property, as is clear from his words. Therefore he wants to say that the Son, by reason of his filiation, which is his proper notion alone, does not agree with the Father or with the Holy Spirit.

To the second statement I say that that citation is really in our favor, if it is properly understood. For when he says that the Holy Spirit is known through the Son and with the Son, he does not want to say that the Holy Spirit is known from the preaching and teaching of the Son; but he is known through the Son, and with the Son, as a relative is known by its correlative. For, shortly before he has said that the Holy Spirit depends on the Son, and that one cannot be thought without the other, which is proper to things related. Moreover, in that place he is speaking about the intimate and eternal distinction of the persons, but an eternal distinction should not be taken from our temporal knowledge; otherwise before our knowledge there would not be distinct persons. But if the Son and the Holy Spirit are relative, it is necessary therefore that they be relative, either because the Son is the Son of the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Spirit is the Father, which no one says; or because the Holy Spirit is spirated by the Son, and the Son is spirating or is the spirator of the Holy Spirit, which is what the Catholic Church says. There is nothing opposed to this in what Basil says, namely, that the Spirit subsists from the Father, for he attributes that to the Father as to the principal author, as the Lord himself said: *He proceeds from*

(he Father.

Thirdly, they quote Nazianzen, who in his Oration to the Bishop who came from Egypt said: *Everything that the Father has, the Son also has, with the exception of causality.* Hence it seems to follow that the Son is not the cause of the Holy Spirit, but only the Father. I respond that St. Gregory is speaking about causality with respect to the Son himself, which is a property of the Father, as if he were to say: The Son has everything the Father has, except to be Father. Is Gregory here openly suggesting that the Spirit is from the Son? For, as he had compared the Son with the Father as the product with the producer, so later he compares the Spirit with the Son: *Everything,* he said, *that the Son has, the Holy Spirit has, exceptfiliation, that is, except theproperty ofhisperson, from which he himselfisproduced.*

Fourthly, they cite Damascene in book 1, chapter 11 of his work on Faith: *We say,* he said, *that the Spirit is through the Son and we do not say he isfrom the Son.* St. Thomas in De Pot. q. 10, a. 4 rejects Damascene as someone who followed Theodoretus. But that does not seem to be correct, since Theodoretus clearly denied that the Holy Spirit is from the Son or through the Son; but Damascene denied that he is through the Son.

I respond, therefore, with Bessarion and Gennadius that Damascene did not deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, which pertains to this matter, since he said that the Spirit is the image of the Son, and is through the Son; but he did think that it is safer to say through the Son rather than from the Son, with regard to the way of speaking, because of the heresy of Macedonius and Eunomius, who said that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Son as the primary, indeed also as the only cause. This is like what we say after the heresy of Nestorius, namely, that Mary is not the mother of Christ but the mother of God, not because she is not the mother of Christ, but lest she be thought to be the mother of Christ only, and not the mother of God. Moreover, just as because of the heresy of Macedonius it was rightly said that the Spirit is from the Father through the Son, so now because of the error of the Greeks it is better to say that the Spirit is from the Father and the Son.

Fifthly, as Peter Lombard says in book 1, dist. 11, they quote Leo III, the Roman Pontiff, who for the protection of the Faith ordered the Creed of Constantinople to be written on silver tablets without the addition of the "Filioque" and to be placed on the altar behind the body of St. Paul. This Pontiff lived about the year 700 after Christ, at which time the addition had already been made; therefore the Pontiff removed it.

I respond that the Pontiff did this deliberately so that the memory of the Constantinople Creed might be preserved just as it was, and so that all would understand that that Creed was not condemned nor contrary to our own. For the Church has many Creeds—the Apostolic, Nicene, Athanasian, Constantinople—without any additions, and the same one with the addition; all of them are one and the same, although one may be clearer and more explicit than another. Moreover, the Catholic Church accepts all of those Creeds, and honors them; and just as when the Nicene Creed was adopted, the Apostles' Creed was not abrogated, so also the Sovereign Pontiff prudently ordered that Creed to be preserved honorably in the Church, lest the Greeks think that the Constantinople Creed was repudiated by us.

Sixthly, they cite Theophylact in his commentary on John 3: *Surely the Latins,* he said, *after badly explaining these words and not understanding them properly, also say that the Spirit proceeds from the Son.* I respond that Theophylact lived at the time of the schism, and therefore his authority is not to be recognized. Otherwise we could also cite many others, like Bernard, Rupert, Richard, Thomas, Bonaventure, and other more recent holy authors.

Finally, they offer some reasons for their position. The first reason is that of Theophylact in the place quoted. The Holy Spirit is one; therefore he has one principle, not two, and he proceeds with one spiration, not two. I respond that that reason, which is the main one of the Greeks, has no value. For, although the Father and the son are two spirating, still they spirate with one spiration, and they are one principle of the Holy Spirit. For nothing is multiplied in God, except an opposite relation. But the spiration by which the Father spirates is not opposed to the spiration by which the Son spirates. And certainly if the argument concluded validly, it would also affirm that the Son is not the creator of the world, because the world is one. Therefore it has one principle, and is produced by one action. Therefore if two persons cannot be one principle, nor create with one action, then the Son did not create the world, but only the Father. Therefore, just as the Father and the Son, indeed also the Holy Spirit are one principle of the world, and create with one action, because they have one essence, so also the Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit, and spirate with one spiration, because they have one power of spirating.

Their second reason. The Father is the sufficient principle of the Holy Spirit; therefore he does not need the assistance of the Son. I respond that the Father is also the sufficient principle of creation, and nevertheless notwithstanding this all the persons create, because they have the same power and essence. For, the Son does not spirate with the Father, because the Father needs assistance, but because the Father and the Son have the same spirating power. You can add to this that the Holy Spirit proceeds necessarily from two, because otherwise there would not be a third person, but he would be identified with the second, as has been shown. Therefore, the world is produced necessarily by the three, with a necessity of the producer, not with a necessity of the product; but the Holy Spirit is produced by two necessarily, with the necessity of the producers and with the necessity of the product.

Their third reason. If the Spirit proceeds from the Son, therefore the Son is more similar to the Father than the Holy Spirit is; for, the Son spirates with the spirating Father, and the Spirit does not beget with the begetting Father. I respond: if the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, the Son is going to be more similar to the Spirit than to the Father; for, the Son proceeds with the Spirit, and does not produce with the Father. But neither of these arguments concludes validly, because similitude come from the part of the essence, not from the part of the relations.

CHAPTER XXVIII

IT IS DEMONSTRATED THAT THE ADDITION OF THE FILIOQUE WAS MADE CORRECTLY

What remains is to show that the Latins could have and should have explained the Creed by adding the word *Filioque.* First of all, I will show that they should have explained the Creed in this way, and then that the Latins could do it without the Greeks.

Therefore it is proved that the Creed should have been so explained. For, it is necessary for salvation not to believe that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone. Therefore, once the heresy arose which taught that the Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, a remedy had to be used for an explanation, because occasions for erring must be removed.

The antecedent is proved. For, Athanasius in his Creed, where he stated he is from the Father and the Son, etc., says this: *This is the Catholic Faith, 'which unless a person preserves it whole and inviolable, he will perish forever.* And in the letter to Serapion in St. Thomas's little book against the errors of the Greeks he said: *According to this the Apostle directs that, after one or two reproofs, heretics are to be avoided and you are not to receive them, even if you should see them flying through the air with Elijah, and with Peter and Moses walking with a dry foot on the waters, unless they profess that the Holy Spirit is God, existing essentially from God the Son, just as the Son exists naturally as the begotten God, eternally existing from God the Father, as we profess.* See the similar quotes from Cyril and Epiphanius in St. Thomas's little book against the Greeks.

Additionally it is proved from the decree of the Council of Florence, where the following is declared: *We define that this truth of the Faith is to be believed by all Christians, and accepted, namely, that the Holy Spirit is eternally from the Father and the Son.* Finally, it is proved by reason. For, to believe that the Spirit is not from the Son is, as we have proved, an error against the Scriptures; therefore it is necessary to avoid it. However, here it should be noted that it was not always necessary to believe that the Holy Spirit is not from the Son. For, before this question arose and was defined, it was sufficient to believe that the Spirit proceeds from the Father, in which is also included that he proceeds from the Son. Also it was not necessary to ask whether he proceeds from the Son, but we are always held positively not to affirm errors. Therefore after this question became known, and many began to err, it was necessaiy to provide a remedy, and so the Council of Florence defined the matter in these words: *Moreover, we define that the explanatory words "Filioque" have been added to the Creed legitimately and with good reason or the sake of clarifying the truth and under the impact of a real need at that time.*

Now let us address the second part, and demonstrate, that this explanation could be made by the Latins without the consent of the Greeks. First, the Roman Pope is the Pastor and Teacher of the whole Church, as the Greeks admitted at the Council of Florence, and is clear from the words in John 21:17, *Feed my sheep.* Therefore he can, even without a Council, define matters of Faith. For, since he is the pastor and universal teacher, he cannot err when he teaches *ex cathedra;* otherwise the whole Church would err, which

is held to follow him. But to define matters of Faith pertains to the one who cannot err.

Secondly, even if the Pope were not the pastor of the whole Church, and could not define controversies about the Faith without a Council, still a Council of Greeks and Latins would not on that account be required, but a Council of some Bishops convened by the Roman Pontiff would be sufficient. For he is (at the very least) the Bishop of the first See, and without him Councils do not have any validity, but with him they do have, as Gelasius teaches at great length in his book on anathemas. For, the firmness of Councils does not come from the multitude and diversity of the Bishops, but from the connection with the See of Peter, to whom it was said: *I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail* (Luke 22:32); and various example bear witness to this. For example, the Council of Ariminum had 600 Bishops, part Greeks, part Latins, nevertheless, because the Roman Bishop opposed it, it has always been considered as erroneous by all, both Greeks and Latins. On the contrary, Council II with 150 Greek Bishops, and in which there were no Latins, because it was confirmed by Pope Damasus, by whom Ariminum had been rejected, has always been held in honor. We see, therefore, that the firmness of Councils comes from the See of Peter.

Thirdly, even if the Pope were not the head of the whole Church, nor the Bishop of the first See, but only one Patriarch no greater than the others, still the Greeks could not complain bitterly because of that addition. For, it is a question either of Faith, or of a rite, that is, the Greeks do not want this addition either because it is false and contrary to the Faith, or because although it is true, it does not please them to have it in the Creed.

If it is a question about a rite, certainly just as there are many other different rites of the Greeks and Latins, and because of that there should not be a schism, so also this rite can be tolerated without a schism. Moreover, one Bishop can institute some rite in his own Church without the consent of the others; how much more then the whole nation of the Latins.

But if it is a question about the Faith: provincial or national Councils cannot define something in such a way that it must be immediately accepted by all; however, they can define, and others should not complain about it, but approve it, if they see the matter has been well defined, but if not then to convoke a larger Council. We know that this has been done often in the Church.

The Council of Antioch, composed of a few Bishops, condemned the heresy of Paul of Samosata, and many others in the whole world did not complain, but actually approved it, as is clear from Eusebius's History in book 7, last chapter. The Council of Constantinople, at which there were no Latins, condemned the heresy of Macedonius, and the Latins did not complain but gave their approval. The provincial Councils of Mileum and Carthage condemned the heresy of Pelagius, and no one caused a schism because he had not been invited. The Council of Ephesus condemned the heresy of Nestorius, before the Latins were present, whom the Pontiff Celestine had sent there; the Latins did not complain, but wanted to know what had been done; when they had learned about it they approved it. There are innumerable examples of this. The Greeks, therefore, cannot complain that the question was defined without them, especially since after that definition they were invited to general Councils, not once, nor twice, but often, and the

question was again proposed and discussed when they were present.

If you ask: although the Greeks at the beginning did not have to be invited, still when they could have been invited, why were they not called at the beginning? I respond first of all: it is not certain that they were not invited, as is said at the Council of Florence; for, since we do not know in which Council the addition was made, so we do not know whether the Greeks were present, or not. But if they were not invited, there was a reason. First, because it was not necessary, since the question was easy. For, as Augustine responded to the Pelagians when they asked for a general Council (in book 4, chapter 12 in his letter to Boniface), not every heresy is of such a nature that because of it all the provinces should be upset by it. And surely that is the case with the Holy Spirit. And if general Councils were held, they were held to satisfy the Greeks, not because the difficulty of the matter demanded it. Second, because necessity urged and required speed because of the conflicts that had arisen in Gaul and Spain; and the Bishops could not be summoned so quickly from the remote regions. Third, because it was useless, because at that time there were almost no learned men in Greece. Bonaventure proposes these three reasons in his comments on Sent. 1, dist. 11, q. 1.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE OBJECTIONS OF THE GREEKS ARE ANSWERED

Now it is necessary to refute their objections and the first one is this: the third general Council forbade any change in the Creed. For this is what they said at the end of the Council: *The holy council decided that no one is allowed to profess or else to compose or devise a faith other than that defined by the holy Fathers gathered together at Nicaea with the Holy Spirit. But those who have dared to compose another Faith, or to presentit to those who want to be converted to the knowledge of the truth from among the Gentiles or the Jews, or also from some heresy—if they are Bishops or clerics, the Bishops are to be deposed from the episcopacy and clerics from the clergy; if they are lay persons they are to be anathematized.*

We respond that by this decree an explanation of the Creed is not forbidden, and a change regarding the words, but what is forbidden is a corruption by an addition or a deletion giving a contrary meaning, and this is proved in many ways. First, thus also the words of Paul in Gal. 1 are to be understood, where he anathematizes those who teach other than what he taught. For, he himself taught many other things later, and John wrote his whole Gospel afterwards, where there are many things not found in Paul. Therefore, Paul is not forbidding that some doctrine be added, but only that nothing be added contrary to his teaching.

Secondly, if the Council of Ephesus was speaking about any change in the Creed, then the Creed of Constantinople was abrogated, where the words "who proceeds from the Father" are found. For, the Creed of Constantinople added to the Nicene Creed, among other things, also this phrase "who proceeds from the Father"; and the Greeks have always used the Creed of Constantinople, and not the Nicene Creed.

Thirdly, at the Council of Chalcedon, where many of the Bishops who were at the Council of Ephesus seem to have been present, when it came to composing the Creed, the Bishops demanded that the words "holy Mary is the Mother of God" should be added to the Creed, and as a result of that action a new Creed was written in which many things were changed, added, and removed from the Nicene and Constantinople Creeds. And at the end this prohibition is added: *The holy Council has ordained that, etc.,* as was done at the Council of Ephesus. From these points the explanation of the decree is clearly apparent. And we do not want to say that the fourth Council was opposed to the third, and so all the Bishops of the fourth Council were excommunicated, which no one so far has said.

We can add that the Greeks were not ignorant of the fact that formerly the Latins were of this opinion. For, Hormisdas in his letter to the Emperor Justinian clearly wrote that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son. Likewise they knew that the addition had been made, and nevertheless for about 300 years they remained silent, and did not cause a schism, as is clear, since the addition was made around the year 600, and afterwards the Sixth, Seventh and Eighth general Councils were held with the common consent of Greeks and Latins. Nevertheless, afterwards it occurred to them to make an

objection to us based on the decree of Ephesus: so why did they not object earlier, except for the fact that they knew that there is nothing there against us? The Greeks respond that the Council of Ephesus forbade any change in the Creed, both regarding the content and regarding the words.

To our objection concerning the Creed of Constantinople, which made additions to the Nicene Creed, they respond that the Council of Ephesus accepted for one and the same the Nicene and Constantinople Creed, and forbade any change in the Nicene Creed, as it was explained by Constantinople Council I.

And to our objection from the Council of Chalcedon, they respond that the Council of Chalcedon did indeed publish another confession of Faith, but it did not compose another Creed, which should be repeated in Church, and was to be given to those being catechized; and that the Council of Ephesus was speaking about that kind of a Creed. For the occasion of this decree was this—because many were writing their own Creeds, and were giving them to simple people, but they contained several errors.

But on the contrary, we raise our own objections. If the Nicene Creed and the Constantinople are accepted for the same thing, because they agree on the matter, the same thing could be said about the others, which do agree on the matter.

Moreover, from the fact that the Council of Chalcedon did not compose a Creed, which would be recited often in Church, and still added that clause, that no one should dare to write another Faith and to present it to those being catechized, we conclude that that prohibition should not be understood to be about a change in the Creed regarding words, but regarding the meaning. This is the common and accepted solution; but perhaps the Greeks would object to this. For, even if the Council of Ephesus spoke about the words of the Creed, and wished that in no way something should be added or removed, still this prohibition applied only to individual Bishops, or clerics, or lay persons, but not to Councils of Bishops. For, the words of the Canon mention these persons, namely, Bishops, clerics and lay persons. But it is certain that the Councils are not composed of clerics and laymen, but only of Bishops. And the occasion of writing this Canon also confirms that. For, the Canon was written, because many at that time began to write their own Creeds, not just Bishops, but also clerics and laymen.

Then, how credible is it that the Council of Ephesus wanted to determine a rule for the Supreme Pontiff, or for a general Council? Did those Bishops not know that no one can make a law for his superior or equal? Therefore, since no particular Bishop, or cleric or layman added the phrase "Filioque" to the Creed, but it was done by the Supreme Pastor of the whole Church, and three general Councils gave their approval to it, there cannot be any doubt but that it was done legally.

But again some raise an objection. Although it was permitted for the Latins to explain the Creed with this addition, still it seems that this addition should not have been added to the Creed. For if all the things, which are defined concerning the Creed, had to be added to the Creed, many other things would have to be added, such as that the Virgin is the Mother of God, that the body of Christ truly is in the Eucharist although he has ascended into heaven, etc.

I respond that not everything has to be put in the Creed, but that this phrase was

rightly inserted into it—and I say this for two reasons. First, because after the rise of the heresy, the Creed itself without this addition was an occasion of erring. Second, because it could be added easily without the addition of a new article or a notable change in the Creed itself; and for other additions these reasons do not apply. However, we do not deny that some other phrase could be added to offer a better explanation, if it seems necessaiy to the Sovereign Pontiff or to a general Council.

CHAPTER XXX

THE ARGUMENT IS CONCLUDED WITH THE DIVINE TESTIMONY

Now at the end of this whole argument it is time to taken note of the divine judgment or testimony. For, after the rise of the schism God showed in many ways which of the two erred, the Greeks or the Latins. For, up until the time of the schism Greece so flourished with learned and holy men, that all the general Councils were held among the Greeks; but after the schism, for almost 800 years, they had no Council, no holy man noted for miracles, very few learned men. But the Latins during this same time held twelve general Councils, and innumerable local ones. Likewise, in the various ages, they had men famous for miracles, new Orders of Religious, many learned men.

Furthermore, during this time the Faith of the Latins was propagated by the addition of the east Indians, and of the new world in the West. The Faith of the Greeks has declined steadily to this day: the Greeks, having been convinced in the Councils, were converted to our Faith four or five times, and perhaps even oftener; and they always returned to their same error.

In the debates the Latins always remained superior in the same Faith and doctrine. Finally, among the Latins the kingdoms and empires still remain veiy powerful; but the empire of the Greeks was overcome by the Turkish enemies of Christ and totally destroyed; all of them now live in miserable servitude, and they are forced to endure the heavy yoke of captivity.

And so that they might understand that the cause of their destruction is their obstinacy in the error concerning the procession of the Holy Spirit, on the very feasts of the Holy Spirit Constantinople was captured by the Turks, the Emperor was killed, and the empire completely destroyed. For, as Gerard Mercator proves in his Chronicle, in the year 1453 on the 12th day of May he said that the Mohammedans began the final attack of their army and the next day Constantinople fell. But in that year Pentecost was on May 28, as is clear from the golden number, and the Sunday letter, according to which the movable feasts are calculated [i.e., the liturgical calendar]. For then the golden number was 9 and the Sunday letter A. Therefore, many compare the Greek Church with the kingdom of Samaria, which separated itself from the true temple, and finally was taken into perpetual captivity.

BOOK THREE

On the truth and majesty of the flesh of Christ or the Incarnation

In the previous books we considered the divinity of Christ, which is common to him with the Father and the Holy Spirit, and also his personal distinction from the other two. Now we will treat his humanity, and his flesh or body, and the Incarnation in this Third Book; his soul will be treated in the following book. This present controversy has five parts. In the first part we will consider the contemporary errors concerning the Incarnation. In the second we will show that there are two natures in Christ. In the third we will demonstrate that there is one person in Christ. In the fourth we will explain the nature of the hypostatic union. In the fifth, we will briefly discuss whether from this union the body of Christ obtained the power of being eveiywhere.

CHAPTER I

ON THE CONTEMPORARY ERRORS CONCERNING THE INCARNATION

Therefore, concerning the first part, at this time there are two kinds of errors concerning the Incarnation: for, some openly and directly are opposed to this mystery, while others are opposed obscurely and more indirectly. The Anabaptists pertain to the first group and the Swenckfeldians. The Anabaptists clearly teach that Christ did not have a true body taken from the Virgin. John Cochlaeus asserts this in his book on the errors of the Anabaptists and says that this is one of their main articles of belief.

Furthermore, Memnon, a leader of the Anabaptists, teaches that the body of Christ, coming from the divine substance of the Father, was deposited in the womb of the Virgin, as is clear from the Colloquium of Wismar. Michael Servetus, also one of the Anabaptists, in book 2 of his work on the Trinity teaches that the body of Christ is divine and heavenly, and begotten from the essence of the Father. Gaspar, also a Swenckfeldian, in his book on the divine majesty of the humanity of Christ, teaches that the humanity of Christ after the Ascension is not a creature, but a supercreature, and that Christ himself also by reason of his humanity is the true God. Finally, Peter Canisius says in the preface of his book on the corruption of the word of God, in the year 1571, that the power of the Anabaptists was made known publicly in a debate on this question: Whether Christ assumed his body from the Virgin, or from some other source; that was under the authority of Palatine near Heidelberg.

At this time almost all Lutherans embrace the second error; they teach two things, from which it follows that they are either Eutychians or Nestorians, or a monster composed of both heresies. First of all they say that the body of Christ has the attributes of the divinity, and especially omnipresence. Secondly, they teach that the hypostatic union consists in the communication of the divine attributes to his body and to his humanity. And if they want those attributes to be joined essentially to the humanity, then it becomes one with the divinity, which is the Eutychian heresy. But if they want it to be joined accidentally, then the persons of God and man will be distinct, and one will be in the other through indwelling and per accidens, which is clearly Nestorian. We will deal with the refutation of this later; now we are only explaining their opinion.

The author of this error seems to be Jacob Faber Staputensis; for, this is what he writes on chapter 12 of 1 Cor.: *The body of Christ, that is, the assumed humanity fills heaven and earth. For, it is wherever the Word of God is, because the Word became flesh, and therefore the Word is nowhere without flesh.* And on chapter 14 of John he writes the following: *Since the Son is in the Father and in all the saints who are in heaven and on earth, is he there also corporeally? Why not? But without a limit, unless you say he is there is a divine and incomprehensible way, which should be said to be not so much a vtay, but not a way.*

At the beginning Luther followed him; and although he claims everywhere that he believes there is one person in Christ, and two natures, nevertheless his teaching indicates something else. For, in his Sermon on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in volume 2 of his works on page 112 he said: *We believe that Jesus Christ is, according to his humanity, placed above all creatures and that he fills all things.* And immediately after that: *And that he has all things in his hand, and is present everywhere.* Likewise in that book he says that the words of Christ "This is my body" are still valid, and he teaches at length that the right hand of God is everywhere. Then he assumes that the body of Christ is at the right hand of God, and as he himself says: *Not in the littlefinger, of in the tip of the right hand, but in the whole;* and from that he concludes that the body of Christ necessarily is everywhere. Likewise, in the book called the Confession of Martin Luther on the Lord's Supper, he says that he clearly proves that the Body of Christ is really present in the Supper, because he is eveiywhere. But he says that he proves that it is everywhere, because it is at the right hand of God which is everywhere; and in the same place he says there are three ways of being in place.

The first is locally, that is, circumscriptively, and in this way he does not want the body of Christ to be everywhere. The second way is spiritually or through penetration, and he says that this applies to a glorified body, but he says that Christ's body is not everywhere in this way. The third way is heavenly and divine through the hypostatic union, and in this way he attributes ubiquity to the body of Christ, and says: *It is necessary to place the body of Christ, which is one person with God, very far outside of creatures, namely, as far away as God himself is beyond creatures, etc.* With these words he seems to say absolutely that the body of Christ is not a creature, but God, since he wants it to be located very far away from creatures, and still to be everywhere. Hence it follows that he is not separating it from creatures according to local distance, since it is everywhere,

but with a distance of dignity and excellence, and therefore that it is really God. And in the same place he reprimands the Zwinglians because they attribute the passion of Christ to his humanity alone, and not also to the Godhead. But certainly, if the body of Christ is not a creature, and the Godhead suffered, then it seems that there is only one thing made out of two natures, and he repeats this same thing in his book on the Councils; in fact, he said that the Zwinglians are in error when they say that the divinity of Christ could not suffer, where (as I said elsewhere) he defends the idea that Nestorius and Eutyches erred only in their way of speaking.

John Brentius developed this doctrine so much that he is thought to be the author of it, but that is not so since he follows Luther. First of all, therefore, in his Apology for the Confession of Wittenberg, in the treatise on the Lord's Supper, he says explicitly that the body of Christ is everywhere because of the hypostatic union; and in his book on the two natures of Christ and his Ascension and sitting at the right hand of God, he says the same thing and proves it in many ways; later we will refute his arguments. In the same place he says that the body of Christ even before the passion was in heaven invisibly, and that now also it is not in a certain place in heaven, but everywhere. Finally, in another book on the majesty of Christ's humanity, he places the hypostatic union in this—that the Son of God poured all his gifts and properties into the Son of Mary. In this he is at the same time a Nestorian, by distinguished the Son of God from the Son of Mary, and he is also a Eutychian, by attributing all the divine attributes to the body of Christ. *The humanity of Peter,* he said, *is in only one place; but the divinity with which it is filled and sustained, diffuses itself everywhere; and since for this reason Peter and God, or the Son of God who is in Peter, are two distinct hyposteses, or persons: why for the same reason do not the Son of Mary and the Son of God, who is in the Son of Mary, become two persons?* These are his words. There he places only this difference between the union of God with Christ and with Peter, that God does not have Peter united to himself everywhere, and therefore he is distinguished from him personally. However, he has Christ united to himself everywhere, and therefore he is not distinguished from him personally.

But you will note in this place, and in the following words of Brentius, the Nestorian expressions—the Son of God is in the Son of Mary: likewise, the Son of God assumed the Son of Man. Thus, he says further in the same book: *Since God or the Son of God is said to have assumed, or united a man to himself, or the Son of man personally, that does not signify only that God by his substance or essence exists in a man, and confers some of his gifts on the man (for thus it could be said that God united to himself personally, not only the seed of Abraham, or the Son of the Virgin, but also any man whatsoever, indeed any creature whatsoever), but this really is signified—that he so unites and joins himself with man, that he confers all his majesty on him and he adorns him not with just one, or two, or many gifts, but with infinite gifts, and so with all, and I say with all his heavenly and divine gifts.* Also when explaining the meaning of "the Word became flesh" he said: *This is of such a nature that the Son of God so fills the Son of Mary, that he communicates to him all of his power, wisdom, felicity and presence; for, if this is not the meaning, then there will be no distinction between Christ and other men.* He repeats this often; in these words certainly you can see that the hypostatic union is nothing other than the effusion of

(he gifts and attributes of God into the human nature of Christ.

Now Matthias Illyricus in his book on the Ascension of the Lord, in his comments on Acts 3:21: *whom heaven must receive,* contends that Christ the man is not in heaven as being in a place, but rather that heaven is in Christ, since he is everywhere. And in the same place he says that Christ, on the day of the Ascension, ascended up to the clouds, then he did not go farther in that form of a visible body, and circumscribed, but in some way disappeared, so that now he is nowhere in that visible form, but he is everywhere with his invisible majesty. But what is this other than to completely destroy the true body of Christ?

Martin Kemnitius in his book on the two natures of Christ wants to be seen as very cautious, and he turns everything upside down in an amazing way. For, in chapter 30, where he deals explicitly with the question whether the body of Christ is everywhere, he does not dare to say absolutely that it is everywhere, but he says he is where he wills to be, and that he could be everywhere if he so wishes, but he either contradicts himself, or says what others say. For, first of all, at the beginning of the book he presents the principal texts of Scripture for the majesty of Christ, and among other things he refers to Matt. 28:18: *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.* And he explains it in this way: *All authority has been given to me,* that is, omnipotence; *in heaven and on earth,* that is, omnipresence. Then in chapter 4 he has these words: *This union is so close, individual, incontrovertible and inseparable, that the divine nature* τοϋ λογοϋ does not wish to be, and it cannot, and it must not be thought or sought or perceived to be outside of this union with the body, but only in the closest union. And further on he repeats this several times. But if the divine nature cannot be thought or comprehended without the body, it necessarily follows that the one is of the essence of the other, and therefore that they are of one nature.

In the same place he says that from the hypostatic union all the divine gifts are communicated to the body or to the humanity. And in chapter 21 he says that, in addition to the infused and created gifts, also the attributes proper to the divinity are communicated to the assumed nature, and therefore omnipotence and omnipresence. Finally, in chapter 30 he says that the humanity of Christ is really present to the faithful not only in the Supper, but also outside the Supper in the Church. And he adds that even outside the Church all things are subject to Christ's humanity, and that the humanity of Christ dominates all things, and rules all things, not through vicars as though he were distant from things, as kings govern provinces through others, but he has all things present: and is this not to be everywhere?

John Wigandus teaches something similar in the book on the communication of idioms, and Nicolas Selneecerus in a book on the pedagogy of the Spirit, where he explains the article of the Creed on the Ascension. Also John Timanus, a pastor in Bremen, in a book which he calls a medley of opinions, cites several testimonies of important Lutherans that the body of Christ is everywhere. Andreas Musculus, according to Staphilus in a book on the disciples of Luther, contends that the divinity of Christ suffered on the Cross, and he proves it with many quotes from Luther.

Likewise Jacob Andreas Smidelinus, the superintendent of Wittenberg, a notable

Brentian, in the theses debated at Tübingen absolutely does not acknowledge any hypostatic union other than that of the communication of gifts, and that is accidental. For, in thesis 20 he says this: *It is not to be imagined or thought any other presence of God in Christ than what is present in all other creatures, that is, regarding the* οὐσία *of the divinity, which in creatures is discerned as energy, which works and operates in a different way in different things; so everything is given to Christ, so that now outside of him nothing, but in the man and through the man Christ everything works in everything.* And in thesis 22 he says this: *But it is not with this real fullness by the communication of all divinity, that the human nature is mixed together with the divinity, or completely abolished, but what is essentially divine, that is communicated to the humanity per accidens in its own way.* And in thesis 24 he said: *The hypostatic union is to be defined with this idiom alone*—κοινονία.

Finally, the Concordia Evangelica, published in the year 1580, seems to have this purpose especially—to establish the idea of Ubiquity and to destroy the mystery of the Incarnation. For, in the epitome of the controversial articles, in article 7 § 5, it says that the right hand of God is everywhere, and that the humanity of Christ has been raised up to it. In article 8 §11 it says that, from the conception itself of Christ, that man was assumed into God, and exalted at the right hand of God, so that not only Christ as God, but also as man can do all things, know all things, be present to all creatures. Moreover, it says that Christ did now show all these things until after the resurrection, when he put off the form of a servant. Then in an abundant repetition of the same articles they prove all of that at great length.

But it is to be observed that the Churches in Saxony changed their opinion three times. For in the beginning, when Luther was teaching, with him they defended ubiquity. Then after Luther's death, under the leadership of Melanchthon, they began to oppose ubiquity contrary to Illyricus and Brentius. For, Philippus, commenting on chapter 3 of Colossians, openly condemns ubiquity, and he says that Christ is in a certain place in heaven regarding his body, but everywhere according to his divinity. And in a letter to Fridericus, a palatine friend, which he wrote in the year 1559 he said: *Some people have invented ubiquity.* And he adds to that: *They are all monstrous, ignorant in their learned old age.*

Hence also in the year 1571 they held a Synod in Dresden, having gathered together all the superintendents of the duchy of Saxony, and also the doctors from the academies of Leipzig and Wittenberg. There they stated that the ubiquity of the body of Christ is a horrible profanation of all the articles of the Creed, and a renewal of all heresies. *That which is the special principle,* they said, *of our Faith and our Church, namely, the article about the two natures of Christ, by a real fabrication of idioms, and by a physical communication in the natures themselves is corrupted horribly; and on the contrary it has been sufficiently and clearly demonstrated that the heresies already condemned in the past of Marcionites, Valentinians, Manicheans, Samosatians, Sabellians, Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Monothelitists are being brought back and renewed.* And after that they say: *This fabrication of a physical communication, which in our time first began to be introduced with the ubiquity of the body of Christ, from the very beginning*

was *unknown to the whole Orthodox Church and to the whole Christian world, and now it is rejected by the Pontiffs themselves and severely rebuked.* And after that: *That fabrication of ubiquity in a dreadful way corrupts almost all the articles of Faith about Christ, and above all it destroys and overturns the distinction between the divine and human natures of Christ.* That is what they say. There they also rejoice in the fact in Saxony the same Faith has always remained unchanged, and that there is agreement about doctrine.

But ten years had not passed when some new Concordia appeared in the same Wittenberg and Leipzig and other places in that region, in which that ubiquity, which had been so greatly condemned, was accepted as an article of Faith. Thus, there are the Concordia published in 1580 on page 731: *Really he fills all things, and being present everywhere not only as God but also as man, he rules from sea to sea.* That is what they say; and they repeat the same thing before on page 572, and afterwards on page 745, and then they reject as impious the Council of Dresden, which was assembled in the Holy Spirit, as they believed. And still do they not see how openly they are deceived by Satan?

Those who wrote against this ubiquity, besides the Scholastics on 3 Sent., dist. 22, were Claudius Sanctius in book 4 on the Eucharist, and before him some of our own teachers wrote some theses on the majesty of Christ the man, which were published at Ingolstadt in 1564. And afterwards in 1582 and 1584 Gregory de Valentia, also from our society, wrote four books against ubiquity. From among the adversaries, Henricus Bullingerus wrote a book on the two natures of Christ, Peter Martyr a Dialogue on the location of the body of Christ, and Theodore Beza wrote a book on the omnipresence of the body of Christ against Brentius, and a second book on the hypostatic union of the two natures in Christ against Schmidelinus.

CHAPTER II

THE HERESY OF EUTYCHES IS EXPLAINED

Now as we come to the second part, it is necessary to demonstrate that there are two natures in Christ; but first the opinion of Eutyches must be explained, since he is the champion of the heresy which we are now going to refute. Therefore, it should be known that the heresy of Eutyches was that in Christ, after the Incarnation, there was and is only one nature; for he thought that in no other way could he defend against Nestorius that there is only one Christ and not two.

Then he said that one nature was made out of the divinity and the flesh, and that by a conversion of the divinity into the flesh, because it is written in John 1:14, *And the Word became flesh.* And because one becomes the other, it is changed into it, just as when *the water became wine,* water was changed into wine. And now when bread by consecration becomes the body of Christ, the bread is changed into the body of Christ.

Thirdly, he said that the divinity of the Word was born, suffered, died, and was buried; this follows from the previous error. For if the divinity was changed into flesh, and the flesh is said to have been born, suffered, died, and buried, certainly the divinity must be said to have been born, suffered, died and buried. For the divinity is not thought to have been changed into flesh in such a way that it ceased to be divine, as water ceases to be water when it is changed into wine. The reason for this error was, because he thought that Nestorius, who denied that Christ as God was born and suffered, could not be refuted, unless the divinity of Christ were shown to have been born and suffered.

Fourthly, he said that the body of Christ was not of the same nature as ours, and that the Word was not changed into a true body, but into some kind of apparent or ghostly body, so that the Word only pretended to be a man, and to be born and die, rather than what he really was. The reason for this is, because it seems unworthy of God that he should be a true body, and really be born, suffer and die.

And so this heresy was the same as the heresy of Valentinus, Manichaeus, and of the others who denied the true humanity of Christ. Afterwards among the Lutherans who followed this error were Gaspar Swenckfeldius and Andreas Musculus, if we are to believe Staphilo in his book on the Concordia of Luther's disciples. That this was the heresy of Eutyches can be known from the letter of St. Flavian to St. Leo, which is #9 among the letters of St. Leo, and from letter 97 of St. Leo to the Emperor Leo, and from book 4 of Theodoretus on the heresies.

However, it should be noted that this heresy took it origin before the time of Eutyches, and that Eutyches himself was not its first author, but the principle promoter of the heresy. For, Apollinaris had taught it before, as Epiphanius says in Heresies 77, Augustine in Heresies 55, and Vincent Lérins in his Commonitorium. Athanasius in his letter to Epictetus also refutes the same error without naming its author, and Ambrose in chapter 6 of his book on the Incarnation of the Lord, and Cyril in his book on the right Faith to Theodotius; all of these had already died when Eutyches appeared on the scene.

Furthermore, the Catholic Faith always acknowledged after the Incarnation two

integral and perfect natures, divine and human, with no confusion or mixture which are joined together in the one person of the Word; likewise that the divine nature was not born and did not suffer, but that the Word was born and suffered in his human nature; and finally that his nature is human and is of the same species as ours. All of these points can be proved by the testimonies of the Scriptures, the Councils and the Fathers.

CHAPTER III

THE HERESY OF EUTYCHES IS REFUTED

First of all, therefore, the words of the Lord in John 3:13 testify that there are two natures in Christ, against the first error of Eutyches: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven.* Certainly he who spoke and was seen, and said he was the Son of man, was also the Son of man according to that nature through which he was seen and was speaking. Then he was not in heaven, but only on earth, that is, at home with Nicodemus. And he was not God, but a man, because God cannot be heard, or seen, or touched by the senses of the body. And he had not descended from heaven, but he was born on earth from a woman; and still the same one says that he descended from heaven, and also then when he was speaking on earth, he said that he is in heaven. Therefore Christ had another nature besides the human, according to which he could be in heaven, when according to his human nature he was on earth.

The same point is proved from the words of the Lord in John 5, 10 and 11, for in John 5:18: *He not only broke the Sabbath but also called God his Father, making himself equal with God.* And in John 10:30 he said: *I and the Father are one.* Therefore the Pharisees rightly concluded that Christ by those words wanted to assert that he is God. But in John 14:28 he said: *The Father is greater than I.* But it cannot in any way be that, according to the same nature, he would be equal to the Father, and indeed one with him, and nevertheless be less than the Father.

Moreover, in John 8:58 the Lord says: *Before Abraham was, I am.* But the same Jesus was born in the days of Caesar Augustus (Luke 2:1), and was 30 years old in the 15th year of Tiberias (Luke 3:1). But it cannot be that the same individual was living before Abraham and after him. In John 20:28, after Thomas had seen and perhaps touched the wounds of the Lord, he exclaimed: *My Lord and my God.* But certainly what he saw and touched was not God, but flesh; and still he confessed that he is both God and Lord, whose flesh he had seen; therefore he was both God and man. St. Peter clearly teaches this also when he says in Acts 2:33: *Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God... he has poured out this which you see and hear.* For, to be exalted does not pertain to God, but to a creature: to pour out the Holy Spirit does not pertain to a creature, but to God.

Likewise Paul speaks in this way to the Bishops in Acts 20:28: *The Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of the Lord which he obtained with his own blood.* But God as God does not have blood, for the Spirit is God; and the one who has blood as such is not God; therefore he who is God and pours out blood necessarily has two natures. In Rom. 9:5 Paul said: *And of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever.* Here the Apostle says that Christ is from the Jewish race according to the flesh, and nevertheless is God at the same time over all things, that is, according to his divinity. Finally, the same Paul in Phil. 2:6 says that Christ, when he was in the form of God, received the form of a servant. In his explanation of these words St. Vigilius said in book 2: *It is astonishing why some are afraid to say that he has two natures, since Paul says he has two forms.*

That the two natures are not mixed together, nor that the divinity was changed into the humanity, will now be proved against the second error. For all Scripture cries out that God is immortal and incorruptible, as we read in Mal. 3:6: *Iam the Lord and I do not change.* Num. 23:19: *God is not a son ofman that he should change.* Jas. 1:17: *With whom there is no variation.* 1 Tim. 1:17: *To the King ofages, immortal, invisible, etc.* And in 1 Tim. 6:16: *Who alone has immortality, etc.*

However, that the divinity was not born, that it did not suffer and die as the third error asserts, is deduced both from the words, for one who is immutable, and immortal, is not bom in time nor can he die in any way according to that whence he is immutable and immortal, and also because the Scriptures, when they teach that Christ was bom in time, suffered and died, add "according to the flesh"; in this way they clearly indicate that Christ was not born, that he did not suffer or die according to his divinity. Thus we read in Rom. 1:3: *Who was descendedfrom David according to theflesh.* And in chapter 9:5: *Oftheir race, according to theflesh, is the Christ.* And 1 Pet. 3:18: *Beingput to death in theflesh, etc.* And in chapter 4:1 : *Since therefore Christ suffered in theflesh, etc.*

Finally, we can add some clear testimonies ofillustrious doctors ofthe Church for the confusion ofthose Lutherans, who are not afraid to attribute the passion to the Godhead. Thus Epiphanius in Heresies 76 on page 286 said: *For not because the only-begotten suffered in theflesh is thepassion to be attributed to the Divinity.* And after that: *But also the Lord himselfcame, and having assumed mortality to himself, he truly suffered, but his Divinity did not suffer.*

Athanasius in his letter to Epictetus said: *What devil dared to say this—that the body bom ofMary is consubstantial with the divinity ofthe Word? Or who was so wicked as to say and at the same time think that the Godhead underwent circumcision?* And Cyril in his letter to Nestorius in the name of the Council of Alexandria said: *We say that he suffered and rosefrom the dead, not because God the Word suffered in his nature, because God is outside ofall suffering, but because his body endured it, which had become his own.*

St. Anastasius in book 4, which is on the passion and incapacity for suffering ofChrist, said: *And we confess that Christ was capable ofsuffering according to the statement of the wise Paul, and that his divine nature was not ofsuch a nature that we can say that his humanity was not capable ofsuffering.* And after that: *Indeed it is God who suffers, but at the same time the Divinity is not affected by the externalpassion.* John Damascene in book 3, chapter 4: *When we speak about the Divinity, it is not about it that we mention the thingsproper to the humanity, for we do not say the Divinity is capable ofsuffering.*

St. Ambrose in book 10, n. 107 on Luke: *It was not the death ofthe Divinity, but ofthe man.* The Council of Seville II in chapter 13: *It is stupid to attribute the passion to the divine nature; but itpertains only to the created and human nature, for only the fleshfelt the punishment ofthe cross.* St. Augustine in chapter 73 of his book on the heresies said: *It is a heresy which says that the Divinity in Christ suffered, when hisflesh is contemplated on the cross.* St. Leo said in letter 10: *The inviolable nature is united to apassible nature, so that what was suitablefor our remedy, one and the same Mediator ofGod and men, Christ Jesus, could both diefrom the one and not diefrom the other.* St.

Vigilius said in book 4: *One and the same Son of God died according to the form of a servant, and did not die according to the form of God.*

But that the flesh of Christ is of the same species as ours, against the fourth error, and that Christ not just apparently, but really was born, suffered and died, can be proved easily. For, in Matt. 1 and Luke 2 the Virgin is said to have given birth to her *first-born Son.* But how could the Virgin have Christ as her Son, if the flesh of Christ was not true flesh conceived from the flesh of the Virgin? Similarly, Paul says in Heb. 2:14: *Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same.* What, I ask, is "partook of the same," except to be the flesh and blood of the same nature?

Now should not the Gospels and the letters of the Apostles be proof of many lies, when passim they say that Christ is a man, and the Son of man, and that he had a mother and relative, and also that he was hungry, ate, walked, became tired, and finally when they say that he suffered, died and was raised from the dead? For none of these things can be affirmed of a ghost. But the Scriptures not only call Christ a man before the resurrection, but also after it. For, in Acts 7:55 Stephen says: *I see the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God.* And Paul in Acts 17:30: God *has fixed a day on which he will judge the world in righteousness by a man whom he has appointed, etc.*

Next, if Christ did not really die, nor truly rose from the dead, then he did not truly redeem us, and we are still in our sins, as the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 15:17. Finally, in Luke 24:39, when the disciples thought they were seeing a ghost or a spirit, and not a true man, the Lord said: *See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have.* And these quotes are from the Scriptures.

The same point can also be proved from the Councils. For, against this heresy the Council of Chalcedon was held, which was the greatest of all, namely, with 630 Bishops. And when in the first meeting the Faith of Eutyches and Dioscorus was recited, in which was contained that there were two natures in Christ before the union, but afterwards only one made out of the two, the Council exclaimed: *Anathema to the one who said that, anathema to those who said that.* Afterwards in the Creed of Faith they put it this way: *(We confess that) one and the same Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son, must be acknowledged in two natures, without confusion or change, without division or separation. The distinction between the natures was never abolished.* The same Creed was also decreed afterwards at the Fifth Council in canon 2, at the Sixth Council in acts 4 and 17, and at the Lateran Council against the Monothelitists, held under Martin I in canons 4 and 6 of the last session, at the Council of Toledo VI in chapter 1, at the Council of Toledo XI in chapters 5 and 6, and at Seville 11 and 13, and in many others.

The same truth can be confirmed from the Fathers, but Theodoretus, Leo, Vigilius and Gelasius, and also Seville Council 11 will save us the trouble. For Theodoretus in the dialogue *Immutabilis,* and in the dialogue *Inconfusus,* and in the dialogue *Impatibilis,* in which he refutes this error, quotes abundantly the testimonies of almost all the old Fathers who lived before him. St. Leo did the same thing in letter 97 to Leo Augustus, and St. Vigilius in book 5 against Eutyches, and Gelasius in his book on the two natures of Christ, and the Council of Seville II in the last chapter; these testimonies have seemed to us to be enough.

CHAPTER IV

THE ARGUMENTS ARE ANSWERED, WHICH WERE MADE FORMERLY AGAINST WHAT WAS DEMONSTRATED IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER

It remains to answer the arguments of the adversaries. And the first thing to consider is the authority of the Fathers and the Councils. For, at the Council of Chalcedon after the letter of Cyril to John of Antioch, Eustachius, the Bishop of Beritensis, said that St Cyril wrote that it is not necessaiy to understand in the mystery of the Incarnation two natures, but one nature incarnate of God the Word. And in the Lateran Council under Martin I an anathema is declared against those not confessing the incarnate nature of the Word. Damascene says the same thing from Athanasius and Cyril in book 2, chapters 6 and 7 in his treatise on Faith. Also Gregory Nazianzen in his letter to Chelidon speaks about the deified flesh, which seems to be the same thing as if he said the incarnate divinity.

I respond that the nature of the Word can be said to be incarnate, if it is understood in the proper way, as the Fifth Council explains it and Damascene in the place cited above, that is, that it is incarnate not by a conversion into flesh, but by the union with the flesh in the one hypostasis of the Word. Althougji the words which are cited in the Council of Chalcedon by Eustachius seem to be those of Cyril, it is probable that they are not from Cyril, but that they were inserted into his works later by the heretics. For, the Catholics in that Council cried out loudly against those words when they heard them, saying that they seemed to be the words of the heretic Dioscorus rather than those of Cyril. Furthermore, Gregoiy Nazianzen in his letter to Chelidon says that the flesh deified by the Incarnation has the meaning that it became the flesh of God through union with the Word, but that it did not become God through a conversion into divinity.

The second aigument. If there are two natures in Christ, there will be two Christs according to the heresy of Nestorius, and therefore God will not be a Trinity, but a Quatemity. For, if the Father and the Son are said to be one God because of one essence, why will there not be two Christs because of the two essences?

I respond: concrete names are never multiplied unless the suppositums are multiplied, and if they are substantive, they also require a multiplication of the form, otherwise they cannot be expressed except in the singular. For, someone who has two artistic skills is not said to be two artists, but one artist having two skills; and someone having several garments is not said to be several clothed men, but just one. Therefore, since in Christ there is only one suppositum, it cannot be said that there are several Christs, or Lords, or Sons, but just one. On the contrary, the Father and the Son are said to be one God because of the unity of form; for, since two are required for the multiplication of substantives, if one ceases, the result is unity, which is the absence of division; but the reason for all of this is especially the customaiy way of speaking.

In addition, the name of Christ does not signify the nature, but the person; and because of this, as Nazianzen says in his letter to Chelidon, just as in the Trinity we say one and another because of the number of persons, but not one thing and another thing because of the unity of nature, so also in Christ after the Incarnation we say one thing and another thing because of the number of natures, but not one individual and another because of the unity of the person. And

it does not follow that there is a Quatemity after the Incarnation, because the Trinity, which is in God, is of persons and not of natures; but the Incarnation does not increase the number of persons. Moreover, through the Incarnation nothing new is added to God, who is absolutely perfect, and so he cannot increase or decrease, but there is an increase of much good to human nature, as Athanasius rightly teaches in his letter to Epictetus and so gives an answer to this argument

The third aigument In John 1:14 it is not said that the Word received the flesh, but *the Word became flesh,* as it is said in John 2:9 that the water became wine, but the water became wine through a conversion of one into the other, so that afterwards there were not two natures, but just one. Therefore, in the same way, the Word became flesh through the conversion of the Word into flesh, and although before the union there were two natures of the Word, and of the flesh, still after the union there is one nature.

Theodoretus in the Dialogue which is called "Immutabilis" responds accurately to this aIgumenζ and he cites the Scriptures which prove that the Word not only became flesh, but also that the flesh was assumed by the Word. For, in Phil. 2:6 we read this: *Who, though he was in the form of God... emptied himself, taking the form of a servant.* And in Heb. 2:16: *It is not with angels that he is concerned but with the descendants of Abraham.* And in John 1:14 after the Evangelist had said, *The Word was made flesh,* lest we think that it was done through a conversion, he adds immediately: *And he dwelt among us,* that is, *The Word became flesh because, after having assumed our flesh, he began to dwell in it.*

Therefore, *The Word was made flesh* should not be understood in the same way as the expression, *water became wine, or bread became his body,* but rather in the way it is said that *Aaron was made a priest by God, David became King.* For, we do not understand that Aaron was changed into a priest or David into a King, but that they began to be what they were not before, and without losing what they were, just as it is said in Gal. 3:13: *Christ having become a curse for us.* This text is cited also as an explanation for this opinion by Athanasius in his letter to Epictetus, Nazianzen in letter 1 to Chelidon, Chrysostom in comments on this text of John, and Ambrose in chapter 6 of his book on the Incarnation of the Lord.

The fourth aigument. If the divinity did not suffer or die, it follows that the heresy of Nestorius is true, who said that only the man suffered and died. I respond that this conclusion is not valid; for, actions and passions pertain to persons, not to natures. Therefore, Christ as God suffered and died, but according to the form of a servant, not according to the form of God. For, Paul says that the Lord himself of gloiy was crucified, in 1 Cor. 2:8, but according to the nature in which he suffered, Peter gives the explanation, when he says: *Since therefore Christ suffered in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same thought* (1 Pet. 4:1).

The fifth aigument. It seems to be unworthy of the divinity that it be said to be changed into true flesh, so that it remained confined in the womb of a woman, that it be put to death on a cross, etc. Therefore, the Word became flesh not really, but only apparently. I respond that the antecedent is true, and from that it is rightly concluded that the divinity was changed into flesh neither really nor apparently. But it is not unworthy of God that according to his human form assumed in the womb of the Viigin he should remain confined, and die on the cross; and therefore it does not follow that the Word should be said to have become flesh not really, but only apparently or falsely.

CHAPTER V

THE HERESY OF NESTORIUS IS EXPLAINED

Another controversy with Nestorius is to be treated here. This is the third part of the proposed dispute. Therefore, it should be understood that Cherinthus long ago separated Jesus from Christ, and he said that Jesus is a mere man bom of Mary and Joseph. However, he said that Christ is the Son of God, who then at the time of the baptism descended on Jesus in the form of a dove, as Irenaeus relates in book 1, chapter 25. The Pelagians again afterwards revived this heresy, and as Cassian writes in books 1 and 6 on the Incarnation, they taught that he was a mere man bom of Mary, and that because of his merits at the age of 30 he became the Christ, and after his passion, because of his merits, he became God, and that other men, with his help, in the same way can live well, and arrive at beatitude justas Christ obtained it.

Shortly thereafter Nestorius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, began to teach the same heresy, and together with him Anastasius, one of his priests, and also Bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, and some others. For, they taught that the Blessed Virgin gave birth to a pure man, and that he not only had a human nature, but also that he was a human person; and therefore that Blessed Mary is not the mother of God, but the mother of Chriſ and that the birth, passion, resurrection and ascension of Christ are to be attributed to the man only.

However, they added that the Son of God was united afterwards to the Son of man in many ways, not indeed substantially by communicating the hypostasis, but accidentally. First, according to an indwelling, because the Word dwelt in the man Christ as in his own temple, according to John 2:19: *Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.* And accordingly they said it was written carefully in Isa. 7:14: *You shall call his name Emmanuel,* that is, he will not be called God, but God with us, that is, dwelling among us, according to John 1:14: *And he dwelt among us.* Secondly, through a union of will and love, because the Son of man was always closely united with the will of God. Theodore added a similitude, which is cited in canon 12 of the Fifth Council: *For Just as a man and a woman are two persons, and still they are said to be one flesh in Scripture, because of conjugal copulation, so also the Son of God and the Son of man are two persons, and still they are said to be one Christ because of their spiritual union.* Thirdly, according to operation, because Christ the man was the instrument which the Word used in the admirable works, which were done by Christ. Fourthly, according to participation, because the Word conferred his name and dignity on that man, so that he was indeed called God and the Son of God, and was adored by all creatures, not because of himself, hut because of him by whom he had been assumed, in the way in which the images of the saints are sometimes called by their names, and because of the real saints are honored mid adored.

That this was the heresy of Nestorius can be understood from the explanation of the Faith which he himself published, and it is contained now in the last volume of the Wks of Cyril. Likewise from the history of Evagrius in chapter 2 and following, in #7

of which Evagrius says that Nestorius died miserably, since his tongue was eaten away completely by worms. Likewise in chapter 4 of the Breviary of Liberatus. Finally, from the Theodoretus in book 4 on the heresies near the end, and in his Counter-statements to Cyril's 12 Anathemas. For Theodoretus in the beginning wrote in favor of Nestorius against St. Cyril, and because of that his writings were anathematized in chapter 12 of the Fifth Council; however, afterwards he changed his mind and was reconciled with the Church at the Council of Chalcedon in session 8, and therefore he placed Nestorius among the heretics in book 4 on the fables of the heretics.

Luther and Calvin favor this heresy not covertly, at least in their way of speaking. For, Luther in his sermon on the Nativity of the Lord said: *Some ignorant people make Christ the man omnipotent.* But the same Luther often taught the opposite, so that he seems to have been more a Eutychian than a Nestorian. Beza also saw this and made note of it; for, at the end of his book against the theses of Jacob Andreas, he quotes this sentence of Luther, and then adds that the sins of Germany and the whole world brought it about that Luther did not persevere in that confession.

But Calvin, in book 1 of his Institutes in chapter 13 § 9, when debating about Christ as he is a certain divine person, says this: *I have not yet attained the person of the mediator,* and in § 23 he said: *I respond that he is the Son of God, because he is the Word begotten from the Father before the world; for there is not yet a word for us about the person of the mediator.* And in § 24: *For because of this, Christ was manifested in the flesh. He is called the Son of God, not only inasmuch as the eternal word was begotten from the Father before the world, but because he assumed the person and office of mediator.* There Calvin always seems to distinguish in Christ two persons, one of the Son of God, the other of the Mediator. And it seems that he cannot be excused, as if by the name of the person of the mediator he understands not a substance but a quality, in the way in which we are accustomed to say that another assumes the person of a judge or of a lawyer. For, in the same § 6 he said: *I call the person subsistence.* Therefore, at least he cannot be excused for a vicious equivocation. But in a very clear way Brentius favors this heresy in his book on the Majesty of the man Christ, where he often repeats that the Son of God is in the Son of Mary; and Smidelinus does the same in his theses, as we said above.

CHAPTER VI

THE HERESY OF NESTORIUS IS REFUTED

Now we will refute this heresy briefly, and we will prove that there is one person in Christ, and that he is not a mere man, but the Word of God himself, born according to the flesh of the Virgin, and that he suffered on the cross and died. First of all, all of the testimonies we cited against the new Samosatenians, and the new Arians in the first book, in order to prove that Christ is the true God, are no less effective against Nestorius than they are against the new Samosatenians and Arians.

Moreover, the New Testament is full of such testimonies. For example, there is Matt. 16:13: *Who do men say that the Son of man is?... Simon Peter replied: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* There Peter clearly confesses that the Son of man is the Son of the living God. Then there is Luke 1:35: *Therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God.* Therefore, the very one who is born of the Virgin, not someone else, is truly called and truly is the Son of God. Likewise in John 1:14: *And the Word became flesh.* For as we said above against the Eutychians, the true meaning of these words is that *the Word became flesh,* that is, *God became man,* just as we say David became King. Therefore, just as David and the King are not two persons, but one, although his human nature and royal dignity are diverse forms, so also one person is the Word and flesh, although there are two diverse forms or natures—the divinity of the Word and the flesh of a man.

A similar statement is in John 3:13: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man, who is in heaven.* For, this text cannot easily be explained otherwise than it has been explained by Chrysostom, Augustine and Cyril on this text, and by Nazianzen in letter 1 to Chelidon, that is, that the Lord is saying that the Son of man is the same as the Son of God. For otherwise it would be false that the Son of man descended from heaven, and then when he was speaking on earth he was at the same time in heaven.

Similarly in John 10:30: *I and the Father are one.* Certainly these words cannot agree with the human nature, and also the man Christ who was then speaking was not just the temple of the Word, but the Word himself. And in chapter 9:35, the Lord said to the blind man, who had been cured a short time before: *Do you believe in the Son of man? He answered: And who is he, sir, that I may believe in him? Jesus said to him: You have seen him, and it is he who speaks to you. He said: Lord, I believe; and he worshiped him.* Surely the Lord could not have demonstrated more clearly that there is one person of the Son of God and the Son of man. For we see that the very man, whom the cured blind man saw, heard and worshiped, is called the Son of God. And in chapter 20:28 Thomas said to the Lord whom he saw: *My Lord and my God.* Theodore of Mopsuestia distorted this text in an astonishing way, as is clear from chapter 12 of the Fifth Council; for, he said that Thomas did not say, *My Lord and my God,* to Christ, but being amazed at the miracle of the resurrection and raising his eyes to heaven he said to God the Father, my Lord and my God!

But aside from the fact that all the Saints explain it in a different way, also St. John himself in the same place, foreseeing the heresy of Nestorius and indeed writing against Cerinthus who held the same heresy, immediately adds: *But these things are written that you may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God,* that is, *that you do not divide Christ into two persons, into the Son of God and the Son of man, but believe that Jesus the Son of Mary is the same Christ, the Son of God.* Also, John does not say, Thomas said: *My Lord and my God,* but he says: *He answered and said to him,* that is, to Christ, *My Lord and my God.* And in the Greek text there is not the word ὦ, which is a sign of exclamation or admiration, but rather the word is ὁ, the article, which designates a simple confession of truth. But we said many things about this above in book 1, chapter 6.

Now the Apostle in Rom. 8:32 said: *He who did not spare his own Son, but gave him up for us all.* What can be clearer than that? And in 9:5: *And of their race, according to the flesh, is the Christ, who is God over all, blessed for ever. Amen.* Therefore here Christ the man, who was a son of Abraham according to the flesh, was not a temple or instrument of God, but he is himself the true God, blessed above all things on earth. And there is Phil. 2:6: *Who, though he was in the form of God, did not count equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant.* And after that: *He humbled himself and became obedient unto death.* Also there is 1 Cor. 2:8: *If they had understood this, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.* These words are crystal clear; hence we have the Word himself, which is with God in the form of God, and he is truly called the Lord of glory. This same one, I say, took on the form of a man, and in that form he was truly crucified and died.

Again the same Apostle, when he says in 1 Cor. 8:6: *One Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things.* By that expression, *through whom are all things,* he is signifying the same thing John says in 1:3: *All things were made through him,* which with universal agreement are understood to be about the Word of God. Therefore the Apostle wants to say that Jesus Christ born of Mary, and the Son of God through whom all things were made, are one and the same. It is clearly stated in Heb. 1:1-2: *In many and various ways God spoke of old to our fathers by the prophets; but in these last days he has spoken to us by a Son, whom he appointed the heir of all things, through whom also he created the world.* There when he says, *he has spoken to us by a Son,* he is speaking about Christ the man, and nevertheless he says about the same man: *through whom also he created the world.* And in Heb. 2:10: *For it was fitting that he, for whom and by whom all things exist... should make the pioneer of their salvation perfect through suffering.* And after that: *Since therefore the children share in flesh and blood, he himself likewise partook of the same nature, that through death he might destroy him who has the power of death.* There he says that *he for whom are all things and by whom all things exist,* that is, *the true God, who is the beginning and end of all things, had to die for us, and, so that he could truly die, just as we die, he partook of flesh and blood in the way in which we partake of it,* that is, *he truly became a man, just as we are.*

Moreover, John in chapter 1 of his first letter teaches almost nothing other than that there is one person of God and man in Christ: *That which was from the beginning,* he said, *which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, etc.* says that he saw with

his bodily eyes the Word which was from the beginning, which cannot be true, unless it is by reason of the unity of the person. And in chapter 2:22: *Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ?* that is, *the one who divides the Savior into two,* as Cerinthus and Nestorius do. And in chapter 3:16: *By this we know love, that he laid down his life for us.* What does this mean—that God laid down his life for us—except that God died for us? Therefore, the immortal Son of God is not one person, and the Son of Maiy, who suffered death, someone else; but he is one and the same—as the Son of God he was always immortal, as the Son of Mary he was mortal. And in chapter 4:3: *Every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of antichrist.* And after that: *Whoever confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God abides in him.* And in chapter 5:5: *Who is it that overcome the world but he who believes that Jesus is the Son of God?*

The Nestorians respond to all these texts: we do not deny that Jesus is the Son of God, and God, and only one, not two; but he is that with a unity of indwelling, of the will, of operation, of participation, as we said above, not with a unity of person. But Cerinthus also said the same thing about Christ, and nevertheless John says he denies Christ, and does not confess that Jesus is the Son of God.

Furthermore, all the things which the Nestorians attribute to Christ apply also to other saintly men. For, that God dwells in his Saints as in temples is stated in 1 Cor. 3:16: *Do you not know that you are God's temple?* And in 1 Cor. 6:19: *Do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you?... So glorify God in your body.* Also through a union of will the Saints are one with God, no less than a man and a woman through carnal copulation, which Theodore of Mopsuestia attributed to Christ because of his great dignity, and this idea is expressed in the same place in 1 Cor. 6:16-17: *Do you not know,* St. Paul said, *that he who joins himself to a prostitute becomes one body with her? And the two shall become one. But he who is united to the Lord becomes one spirit with him.* What is clearer than that?

But that God operates through holy men, as through instruments, is expressed in Rom. 15:18: *I will not venture to speak of anything except what Christ has wrought through me... by word and deed, by the power of signs and wonders, by the power of the Holy Spirit, etc.* And in 1 Cor. 12:6: *There are varieties of working, but it is the same God who inspires them all in every one.* Finally, that certain holy men are sons and gods also by participation and grace is stated in Ps. 82:6: *I say, You are gods, and sons of the Most High, all of you.* And in Gal. 4:6: *Because you are sons of God, God has sent the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, etc.* Therefore, everything that Nestorius attributes to Christ is also found in other Saints. But it is certain that it is a far different thing for Christ to be God, and the Son of God, than it is for us, since the Apostle says that it is a great mystery of our religion that God appeared in the flesh (1 Tim. 3:16).

Secondly, it is proved from all the Creeds of the Faith. For, in the Apostles' Creed we read: *And in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, etc.* There the one who is the only Son of God is said to be born of the Virgin Mary. The same thing is found in the Nicene-Constantinople Creed. But in the Creed of Athanasius this is added more explicitly: *Although he is God and man, he is not two, but he is the one Christ: absolutely one without a confusion of substance, but*

in the unity of the person.

Thirdly, it is proved from the Councils. For, first of all, at the Council of Ephesus nothing else was defined except that there is one person of Christ, and not two. And at that Council the letter of Cyril to Nestorius was accepted with its twelve chapters or anathemas, which Cyril had published in the provincial Council of Alexandria, before the Council of Ephesus was convened. Hence those twelve chapters were considered afterwards as if they were of the general Council of Ephesus, as is clear from the Roman Council under Martin I.

Therefore, in the first chapter you read this: *If anyone does not confess that God is truly Emmanuel, and therefore that the holy Virgin is the mother of God, let him be anathema.* In the second chapter there is this: *If anyone does not confess that the Word of God the Father is united to the flesh according to his substance, and that there is one Christ with his own flesh, namely the same God and man together, let him be anathema.*

Then also in the general Council of Chalcedon, the decrees of the Council of Ephesus against Nestorius were approved, and again this was defined: *The character proper to each of the two natures was preserved as they came together in one Person and one hypostasis. He is not split or divided into two Persons, but he is one and the same only begotten Son, God the Word, etc.*

Likewise in the Fifth general Council, in canon 4: *If any one says that the union of God the Word with the man was no more than a union by grace or by operation or by equality of honor or by authority or relation, affection or power.* And after that: *but does not confess that the union of God the Word with the flesh animated by a rational and intellectual soul took... let him be anathema.* And in canon 5: *If anyone understands the one hypostasis of our Lord Jesus Christ as admitting the meaning of several hypostases... let him be anathema.* And in canon 6: *If anyone says that the glorious holy Mary, ever virgin, is not the Mother of God in the true sense but only by an abuse of language... let him be anathema.*

The same thing is had in the Lateran Council under Martin I in canon 6: *If anyone does not, following the holy Fathers, confess properly and truly that one and the same Lord and God, Jesus Christ, is from two natures, the divinity and the humanity, united according to the hypostasis without confusion or division, let him be condemned.*

The same teaching is found in the Sixth general Council in acts 4, in the last chapter of the Council of Seville II, in chapter 1 of Toledo VI, and in many others.

Fourthly, it is proved from the Fathers. And especially St. Cyril and John Cassian explicitly refute this heresy. Cyril in his book on the Incarnation of the Lord and in the Apology for the twelve chapters and in almost all of his other works, where he also cites in his favor many testimonies of the older authors. Cassian in book 7 on the Incarnation wrote against Nestorius at the request of St. Leo I and at the end of book 7 he quotes several testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers.

In addition to what they present, we can cite some other sources. St. Ignatius in his letter to the Ephesians said: *The Son of God was begotten before the world, when according to the will and approval of the Father he created all things; he was gestated in the womb, and according to the dispensation he was born of Mary from the seed of*

David, having been conceived by the Holy Spirit.

St. Justin Martyr near the middle of his book on the confession of the right Faith said: *There is one Son, and he died, and that which had died he raised up. Therefore, since you will hear contrary words about the same son, attribute the things heard to the natures: if they are great and divine, attribute them to the divine nature; if something small and human, ascribe it to the human nature. For thus you will avoid a discrepancy of words, since he will receive with both natures, and you will confess the one Son to have preceded oil ages and to be the one in the Scriptures.*

St. Irenaeus in book 3 *Against the Heresies,* from chapter 18 to 22, proves with many testimonies of the Scriptures that Jesus is the one and same Son of Mary and Word of God the Father. Athanasius in his letter to Epictetus, near the end, said: *It was written about the Son of Mary alone that the Word was made flesh. This proves that while to all the others the Word came, in order that they might prophesy, from Mary the Word Himself took flesh, and proceeded forth as man.* And after that: *We do not divide the Son and the Word, but we know that the Son is the Word Himself, by Whom all things are made, and by Whom we were redeemed.*

Gregoiy Nazianzen in his first letter to Chelidon said: *If anyone does not believe that Holy Mary is the Mother of God, he is severed from the Godhead... If any introduce the notion of Two Sons, one of God the Father, the other of the Mother, and discredits the Unity and Identity, may he lose his part in the adoption promised to those who believe aright... If any worship not the Crucified, let him be Anathema and be numbered among the Deicides.*

Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, when explaining the words: *The Lord created me: therefore it is necessary,* he said, *to take the word "begotten" as referring to God the Son; but "created" refers to the one who received the form of a servant. But in all of that we do not say there are two, God separately and man separately (for He was one), mentally considering the nature of each.*

Damascene in book 3, chapter 9 on the Faith said: *The hypostasis of the Word himself exists as the hypostasis of both natures, and it allows no lack of subsistence, etc.*

Now from the Latins. St. Cyprian in book 2, chapter 8 against the Jews said: *Since in the beginning he was the Son of God, he had to be begotten finally according to the flesh, etc.* And in chapter 10 he says that Christ, man and God, was formed from both natures, so that he could be the mediator between us and the Father, etc.

Hilary in book 2 on the Trinity: *The One Only-begotten God, ineffably born of God, entered the Virgin's womb and grew and took the frame of poor humanity. He Who upholds the universe, within Whom and through Whom are all things, was brought forth by common childbirth, etc.*

Ambrose in chapter 5 of his book on the Sacrament of the Incarnation of the Lord said: *Since God always was eternal, he undertook the sacraments of the Incarnation, not divided, but one, because both are in one and one in both, that is, either in the divinity or in the body; for there is not one from the Father, and the other from the Virgin, etc.*

Jerome in comments on Matt. 14 said: *That he went apart alone to pray, you do not refer it to him who satisfied five thousand men with five loaves of bread, but to him who,*

having heard about the death of John, went off in solitude, not because we separate the person of the Lord, but because his works are divided between God and man. And in his letter on virginity to Eustochius he said: *The Son of God, for our salvation, became the Son of man; he waited ten months in the womb to be born, and he who holds the world in his hand is placed in a small manger.*

Augustine in chapter 35 of the Enchiridion said: *Wherefore Christ Jesus, the Son of God, is both God and man; God before all worlds; man in our world: God, because the Word of God; and man, because in His one person the Word was joined with a body and a rational soul.* And in chapter 36: *For what merit had the human nature in the man Christ earned, that it should in this unparalleled way be taken up into the unity of the person of the only Son of God?* Similar statements are found in book 3, chapter 17 on the Trinity, in letter 3 to Volusianus, 102 to Evodius, and 120, chapter 4, Honoratus, and elsewhere.

Finally, St. Leo repeats nothing more frequently than this in all of his sermons and letters, especially in chapter 1 of letter 97 to Leo Augustus, where he says this: *Therefore Nestorius is anathematized who believed that the Bl. Virgin Mary was the mother not of God, but only of a man, so that he made one a person of flesh, the other a person of the Godhead.*

CHAPTER VII

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE REFUTED

Now it is time to refute the arguments of the Nestorians, which for the most part are sophistical. The first argument is based on John 2:19 where the Lord says: *Destroy this temple, etc.,* where he is speaking about his humanity; therefore Christ as God and Christ as man are two persons. For he did not say, "destroy me"; moreover the temple cannot be the same as the one who dwells in the temple. Theodoretus makes this argument in his refutation of the second anathema of Cyril, and later he repeats it often.

I respond that by this argument it is correctly proved that there are two natures in Christ, not however two persons. For, our soul is also said to dwell in our body, as in its own tabernacle, because the nature of the soul is different from the nature of the body; and still it is one person, which is composed of soul and body. In Job 4:19 men are said to inhabit houses of clay, and in 2 Cor. 5:1 the Apostle says: *If the earthly tent* we *live in is destroyed, etc.* And in the same place: *While we are still in this tent, we sigh with anxiety.* And in 2 Pet. 1:14: *I know that the putting off of my tent will be soon.* Therefore, Chiysostom in homily 10 on John from the words "and he dwelt amongst us" rightly concludes that there are two natures in Christ; but Theodoretus does not rightly conclude that there are two persons.

The second argument. The Apostle says about Christ in Phil. 2:7: *Being born in the likeness of men, and being found in human form; therefore, the God Christ was not a man, but similar to men because of the clothing of humanity. It is like a king dressed in rustic clothing would not be a peasant, but only similar to a peasant.*

Wherefore Theodoretus (who, as we said above, at times follows the views of Nestorius), in his commentary on this passage, writes that Paul wanted to say, not that the Word became man, but that he clothed himself in human form.

I respond with Ambrose , Chrysostom, Theophylact and Oecumenius regarding this argument, that Christ was not a man, but similar to men in that meaning in which man is taken here; for, since Paul says Christ was made in the likeness of men, and was found in human form, here he understands the word "man" to signify ordinarily a plain man, conceived from the seed of a man, born in sin, capable of sinning. For that is what Christ seemed to be, but he was not. Paul makes use of this same idea when he says in Gal. 1 that he did not learn the Gospel from a man but from Christ. There doubtless by the word "man" he means a plain man; otherwise he would not say, *but from Christ,* as if Christ were not a man, since the same Paul had said: *There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus* (1 Tim. 2:5).

Furthermore, Chiysostom also gives another explanation, which Haymo and St. Thomas adopt, namely, that the expression "in the likeness of men" signifies a likeness in the human species, and so the meaning is, *Christ became a true man, therefore like others in the same species.* What precedes quite agrees with this explanation: *Taking the form of a servant.* For, as we showed above, human nature is the form of a servant. But the word "form" here does not mean clothing, but the external figure, as Chrysostom, Theophylact

and Oecumenius explain it. For in Greek it is not ένδυμα, but σχήμα, and therefore the meaning is: *Christ with the externalfigure of a body appeared to be one of the human race, but he was a singular individual, and a divine man, or with his externalfigure he showed himselfto be a true man.*

However Augustine in book 83, question 73, Cyril in book 11 on John 14, Hyamo and St. Thomas in their comments on this place understand through "in human form" to be outer clothing. It can be responded to this argument that the humanity is called the clothing of the Word, not because the Word is not truly and substantially a man, but because of the similitude which exists between clothing and humanity. For, just as men are known through their clothing, so through his humanity God is recognized; and just as when we put on clothing, the clothes are fitted to the figure of the body, and so the clothes are changed, not the man; so also, when the Word became flesh, the humanity was changed, while the Word remained unchangeable. Therefore, because of these and other similarities of the same kind, the humanity can be said to be the clothing of the Word, although otherwise the Word truly and substantially became a man.

The third argument is from Heb. 7:3. Christ the Son of God is said to be *without a mother, without a genealogy;* therefore one is the Son of Mary, who has a mother and a genealogy, and the other is the Son of God, who lacks both.

Cassian responds definitely in book 7 on the Incarnation that this argument can be turned back on the adversaries. For, in the same place the Apostle is speaking about the one of whom it is said that he is without mother and without genealogy, and he says about the same one that he is without father; therefore, if that text is understood to be about the Son of God, it follows that the Son of God does not have a Father, which is against the position of Nestorius, who distinguishes the Son of God the Father from the Son of the Virgin Mary. Then Cassian says that the Apostle wanted to explain that there are two natures of Christ—one without a mother, that is, the divine, and the other without a father, that is, the human.

The fourth argument. The name "God" taken absolutely does not signify God united to man, but only God; but Mary did not give birth to God alone, but God united to man; therefore it should not be said that Maiy is the mother of God. Theodoretus writes in his book on the fables of the heretics that this was the argument of Nestorius.

I respond that the name of "God" taken absolutely does not signify God united to man, but also that it does not exclude it from its meaning, and therefore that the consequence of the argument is incorrect. But that the name of God taken absolutely, according to the Scriptures, can be attributed to him who was bom of the Virgin is proved because it is attributed to him who died, because it is attributed to the same one who was bom and died in Acts 20:28: *Take heed to yourselves,* Paul said, *and to all theflock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, tofeed the Church of God, which he obtained with his own blood.* And in 1 John 3:16: *By this we know love, that he laid down his lifefor us.*

The fifth aigument. The Son of Mary said: *My God, my God, why hast thouforsaken me?* (Matt. 27:46). And, *Father, save mefrom this hour* (John 12:27). And he needed an angel to comfort him (Luke 22:43), but those things are not suitable for the Son of God. Therefore the Son of God was not the same as the Son of Mary.

Cyril responds against Theodoretus in defense of the fourth anathema that all of those things are suitable for the Son of God according to his human form just as they are contrary to him according to the form of God; for he is true God and true man.

The sixth argument. No one can beget someone who exists before him. God is before Mary, therefore Mary could not beget God, and so she should not be called the mother of God.

Cassian refutes this argument abundantly in book 7 on the Incarnation, and I will respond briefly that no one can beget someone before him according to that which is anterior. Therefore, Mary gave birth to the God Christ, not according to the divinity whereby he was anterior, but according to the humanity whereby he was posterior. And it is not surprising if we do not have any examples of this, because this mystery is unique.

The seventh argument. A son should be consubstantial (homousios) with his parents; but Christ as God is not consubstantial with Mary, since he is the eternal and omnipotent God, which does not in any way agree with Mary.

Cassian also refutes this argument at length, but the summary of it is that a son should be consubstantial with his parents according to the nature that he receives from them, or inasmuch as he is their son. But Christ as God did not receive from Mary his divine nature, but his human nature, and he is not her son except inasmuch as he is a man. Accordingly it is sufficient if he is consubstantial with his mother inasmuch as he is a man, just as he is consubstantial with the Father inasmuch as he is God.

The eighth argument. Christ is called a Deified man by St. Basil in his commentary on Ps. 60.1 respond that Basil did not say Christ is a Deified man, as Theodoretus falsely in his refutation of the fifth anathema, but that the flesh of Christ is σάρκα Θεοφόρον, that is, *flesh bearing God;* but there is no small difference between a man and flesh. For, the word "man" signifies a person, as also the word "God." But the word "flesh" does not signify a person, but a nature, or rather a part of human nature. Therefore, "Deified man" is not said rightly about Christ, since it means two persons—man and God; but "Deified flesh" is said rightly, because there are two natures—flesh and the Godhead, and the one is the quasi domicile or seat of the other. You can add to this that St. Ignatius in most of his letters calls himself Θεοφόρον or God-bearer. But who would believe that that holy man wanted to assume for himself the title of "Christ"?

But if somewhere among the Fathers (but something I have not been able to find) Christ is said to be a Deified man, it is to be piously explained, so that the meaning will be that Christ by reason of his humanity is a temple for the presence of the Divinity. Similarly, when St. Augustine in chapter 36 of the Enchridion and in chapter 15 of his book on the predestination of the Saints, and elsewhere, often says that the Son of God assumed a man, he understands by the word "man" his humanity.

CHAPTER VIII

IT IS EXPLAINED IN WHAT THE HYPOSTATIC UNION OF THE TWO NATURES PROPERLY CONSISTS

Now the fourth part of our argument follows, in which the definition of the Incarnation is to be explain, so that we can see what it really means to be united hypostatically,

Brentius and Smidelinus, whom we cited above, say that for the divine and human natures of Christ to be united hypostatically is nothing other than that all the attributes or properties of divinity are communicated to the humanity of Christ; but they are said to be communicated not substantially, but accidentally. For, the recently published Concordia, in abundant repetition in article 8, explains that this takes place not through the created and infused gifts, nor in such a way that the divine attributes become natural properties of the humanity, but because the Divinity dwells in the humanity of Christ as being in its own proper body, and in it shines with all of its majesty, power, wisdom, justice, etc., and in it and through it does all things. Therefore, they say it is a union such as is found between a principal agent and its instrument. Hence also both Brentius and Smidelinus say that Christ differs from other men only because of his power, because God works all things through Christ, but through others only some things. This opinion is false, and clearly Nestorian, or even worse than Nestorian.

But the true idea is that for God and man to be united hypostatically means nothing other than that the human nature does not have its own subsistence, but it has been assumed by the eternal Word to the subsistence itself of the Word. In order to get a better understanding of this, it should be noted that several things can be united in three ways.

The first way is essentially, namely, when from several things they become one essence, as matter and form are united, genus and a difference. The union of the Incarnation did not take place in this way, as is clear: both because there would be in Christ only one nature, and it would be neither divine nor human, but some third thing; and also because an essential union never takes place, unless it is from imperfect natures, or if it is from perfect, by some corruption or conversion; but in Christ the natures are perfect and integral.

The second way is accidentally, that is, as when accidents are joined to a subject, or are substantially joined together with the substance, but from this union all that results is an accidental form, as when a house is built out of bricks and wood. So the hypostatic union did not take place in this way, because God, obviously, cannot be an accident or the subject of accidents.

The third way is substantially, that is, as when a substance, which otherwise exists by itself, is drawn to the being of another supposit, and depends on that other as a part of it, and it is in this way that the Incarnation took place. And although there is absolutely no similar example available, still some ideas are given by the Doctors, which offer some kind of explanation.

One concerns the soul and the body, which Justin uses in his book on the confession of the right Faith, Athanasius in the Symbol, and Augustine in letter 3 to Volus. For, the

rational soul subsists essentially outside the body, and still when they are united there is only one subsistence of both. But this example is very defective, both because the soul and the body are imperfect natures, and also because they make one nature, and also because neither draws the other to its subsistence, but both depend on a third subsistence, which is that of the whole composite. But in this mystery, the Word subsisting perfectly in itself draws the human nature to itself.

The second example is that of heated iron, which is used by Basil in his Oration on the holy Nativity, Damascene in book 3, chapter 11, and Origen in book 2, chapter 6 on principles, because glowing iron is one thing, and still it has the properties of iron and fire. This similitude is very pleasing to Brentius, Kemnitius, and other adversaries, but it is the most defective of all. For, in the glowing iron the heat is sustained by the iron, not vice versa; and still they say that the heat refers to God and the iron to man. Also, the heat is not a substance, but an accident. Likewise there is no communication of idioms; for the heat is not said to be the iron, nor the iron to be the heat. Finally, the heat is not drawn to the subsistence of the iron, nor vice versa.

The third example is of a man in whom there are two accidental forms, like the skill of medicine and of jurisprudence. For, there is one suppositum, and still it takes on various names, and does various things, and the idioms are communicated. For the same man is said to be both doctor and lawyer, and he can truly be said to be such, since the doctor handles legal cases, and the lawyer cures illnesses, etc.

St. Augustine in letter 99 uses this similitude, where he says that this proposition, *God is dead,* is similar to this one, *the Philosopher is dead;* for, just as philosophy is not capable of death, and still the philosopher is said to be dead, when the man dies who was a philosopher; so also, although Divinity cannot die, still God is truly said to be dead, because that man is dead who was also God. Among others, John Scotus on 3, dist. 1, q. 1 also approves the same similitude, but this one is also defective, because those forms are accidental, and therefore are not drawn to the subsistence of man, which in this matter must be of special consideration.

The fourth example is that of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure on 3, dist. 1, q. 1, where they compare this mystery to a tree, into which is grafted a branch of another species. A pear tree is a good example, into which a branch from an apple tree is grafted. Certainly the substance of the pear tree is primary, and so the true suppositum, and it does not depend on the grafted branch of the apple tree; and after the insertion is sustains that branch, which otherwise would exist elsewhere; and now it is called a pear and apple tree, and it produces pears and apples. And the pear tree can be called an apple tree, and vice versa; and if by chance that branch should dry out, and then revive, because of that the pear tree is not changed, but all the change takes place in the branch from the apple tree.

Thus, the divine Word, like a large tree, receives the small branch of human nature into its trunk, having been inserted there miraculously by the heavenly farmer; then the Word was both God and man, and he performed divine and human works; and the Word did not depend on the humanity, but the humanity depended on the Word. And when afterwards, after the passion and death, the humanity in a certain way dried up, and then

revived through the resurrection, no change took place in the Word, but all the change was in the humanity.

However, this similitude is defective in two ways. For, that branch is not a perfect tree, but part of a tree, because it does not have roots, a trunk, etc. And before it was grafted it had its own existence; but human nature, which we have compared to the grafted branch, is both a perfect nature and it never had its own subsistence. But if by the divine power a branch were at the same time produced and inserted, the similitude would be defective in only one way.

Therefore, since all similitudes in some way are not fully true, therefore St. Bernard in Sermon 3 on the vigil of the Nativity, and Damascene in book 3, chapter 5, compare the mystery of the Incarnation with the mystery of the Trinity, so that from one singular matter they might illustrate another one that is equally singular. For, just as it is singular that in God there are three perfect hypostases with only one simple nature, so also it is singular that there are in Christ three natures—Divinity, Soul and Flesh with only one hypostasis. But he distinguishes the three natures in Christ—Divinity, Soul and Flesh, lest perhaps it seem to be new, and Augustine also numbers them in book 13, chapter 17 of his treatise on the Trinity.

Therefore, after having given the above explanation, now it is necessary to demonstrate the reality, that is, that the hypostatic union consists in the communication of the subsistence of the Word, not in the communication of the attributes of the Divinity. And we will do it first from what has been said. For, we have shown from the Scriptures that in Christ there is one person and two natures; but this cannot be true, unless there is only one subsistence in Christ, for if there were two, there would be two persons, since a person is an intellectual nature existing by itself. But if there is only one subsistence in Christ, then either the Word communicates his to the humanity, or on the contrary the humanity to the Word. But the humanity did not communicate its subsistence to the Word, as all admit; therefore the Word communicated his subsistence to the humanity, and so the hypostatic union took place.

Secondly, the same thing can be proved from the grave testimonies of those Councils which are also accepted by the adversaries. In the letter of the Council of Alexandria, with the 12 anathemas, which was accepted and approved at the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, this is stated in anathema 2: *If anyone does not confess that the Word from God the Father was united to the flesh according to his subsistence, let him be anathema.* And in anathema 3: *If anyone, with respect to the one Christ, divides the subsistences after the union, let him be anathema.* And anathema 4: *If anyone attributes separately to the two Persons or the two subsistences the expressions contained in the Gospels and apostolic writings, let him be anathema.*

You can add to this that Cyril, in his Apology against the Orientals in defense of the 4th anathema, quoted in his own favor these words of St. Julian, the Roman Pontiff: *The Son of God was incarnate from the Virgin, and he dwelt among men, not manifesting his power among men, for he does this in the prophets and in the Apostles, but perfect God in the flesh, etc.* You see that this sentence in clear words is contrary to Brentius. And in another Apology against Theodoretus the same Cyril quotes these words of Theodoretus

against anathema 2: *According to subsistence in every way we are ignorant of any union.* Here also you see the plain confession of the heretic.

Likewise at the Council of Chalcedon in session 5: *We confess,* the Fathers said, *that the distinction between the natures was never abolished by their union but rather the character proper to each of the two natures as they came together in one Person and one hypothesis.* In this place you will note that the properties of the natures are not mixed, and therefore that the attributes of one nature are not communicated to the other, but only the subsistence or hypostasis is communicated.

Likewise in the Fifth Council, in canon 4 of the last session, you have this: *If anyone says that the union of God the Word with the man was no more than a union by grace or by operation or by equality of honor or by authority or relation, affection, or power.* And after that: *but does not confess that the union of God the Word with the flesh took place by synthesis, that is, according to the hypostasis.* And after that: *The holy Church of God, rejecting these two impious heresies, confesses the union of God the Word with the flesh as being by synthesis, that is, according to the hypostasis.* What could be clearer against Brentius and his disciples, who introduce a union made according to grace, and operation, and dignity? And in canon 5 of the same Council there is this: *If anyone tries to introduce into the mystery of Christ two hypostases or two Persons and, after having introduced two Persons, speaks of one Person as regards dignity, honor, and adoration... and does not confess that the Word of God has been united to the flesh according to the hypostasis and that, therefore, there is but one hypostasis or Person, etc., let him be anathema.*

Likewise in the Lateran Council under Martin I, in canon 6 of the last session: *If anyone does not follow the holy Fathers, confess properly and truly that one and the same Lord and God, Jesus Christ, is from two natures, the divinity and the humanity, and in two natures the divinity and the humanity, united according to the hypostasis without confusion or division, let him be condemned.* And in canon 8: *If anyone does not, following the holy Fathers, confess properly and truly, that the union of the natures by synthesis, that is, according to the hypostasis, by which the one and only Christ exists, is recognized in him without confusion or division, let him be condemned.*

Similarly, in session 4 of the Sixth Council in the letter of Agatho, which the whole Council accepted, it says the following: *They do not unite through a union what is known to have been done according to the hypostasis, but blaspheming they join them together through the act of the will as two hypostases, that is, as two Persons, etc.* The same thing is said in session 17 in the definition of the Council. There you will see that they are condemned in clear words as blasphemers who explain the hypostatic union in any other way than by the subsistence.

Thirdly, it is proved by the argument by the Council of Toledo VI in chapter 1. The Son of God alone is incarnate; therefore the union was made through the communication of that which is proper to the Son, not of that which is common to the other persons. But the subsistence alone of the Son is proper to the Son, while all the essential attributes are common to all three persons; therefore the hypostatic union was accomplished through the communication of the subsistence alone. This reason is fully convincing so that

either what we are saying is true, or the whole Trinity was incarnated, if the definition of Brentius and Smidelinus is true. For, those attributes—omnipotence, omnipresence, perfect justice, etc.—whose communication they say was effected in the Incarnation, are common to the whole Trinity.

Fourthly. The eternal Father communicated all his attributes perfectly to the Son, and much more perfectly than the Brentians say that the same are communicated by the Son of God to the Son of man. Nevertheless, because the Father did not communicate his own proper subsistence to the Son, they are not united hypostatically, but rather Father and Son are distinct hypostatically. Therefore, the hypostatic union does not consist in the communication of the attributes, but only of the subsistence.

This reason is also fully convincing that the Father and the Son are one hypostasis, if the definition of Brentius and Smidelinus is true; or they must admit, whether they want to or not, that the hypostatic union does not consist in the communication of the attributes.

Perhaps they will say that the subsistence is also communicated along with the other attributes. But their words do not give that impression. For, Brentius in his book on the Majesty of the Man Christ, where he tries to show what the hypostatic union really is, whereby Christ is distinguished from other men, says the following: *Therefore, the difference between Christ and Peter is not simply to be derived from the indwelling of the Son of God, but from the communication of his properties: for, the Son of God, although by his essence fills Peter, as also the man Christ. However, he does not communicate to Peter all his properties, but only some of them—he gives life to Peter, he conserves him in life, he gives Peter the power to drive out devils, and even to raise the dead. However, among those he does not make him omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent: but he adorns the Son of man not with just some, but with all of his gifts.* And after that he says: *I have shown that he was made capable of all the properties of God without any exception, and unless he has that capacity, there would be no difference between God and other men, nor could the Word have become flesh.* Smidelinus and the book of Concordia contain similar theses; there I see no mention made of the subsistence, but only of the essential attributes.

Furthermore, whatever the case may be with subsistence, they want the communication of all the attributes to be so necessary for the explanation of the hypostatic union, that, if such communication is lacking, there is no hypostatic union, and where it is present, there is such union. For, Brentius says that if Peter were omnipotent and omnipresenζ he would also be united to God hypostatically. However, once that is posited, the given reasons conclude necessarily, and indeed it follows logically, that the whole Trinity is incarnate, and that the Father and the Son are one hypostasis.

Moreover, two other absurd things follow which are contraiy to the Faith, and which can be listed here as arguments 6 and 7.

PΐΓ8ζ that the body of Christ during the three days of death was not united hypostatically to the Word; for, a dead body is not capable of omnipotence, omniscience, and perfect justice. Second, that Christ the man was not always God; for, Christ merited for himself some gifts, like the glory of his body, and the exaltation of his name, his

ascension into heaven and sitting at the right hand of God. For it is said in Luke 24:26: *It was necessary that the Christ should suffer these things and so enter into his glory.* And Phil. 2:8: *He became obedient unto death, etc.* And Heb. 2:7: *We see Jesus because of his passion crowned with honor and glory.*

But if the communication of all the gifts is required in order to establish the hypostatic union, then Christ merited for himself, at least partially, the hypostatic union; therefore he existed before he was united, but someone who does not exist cannot merit; therefore he was not always united hypostatically, and that is the Pelagian heresy.

In the seventh place. If the hypostatic union required the communication of all the properties and attributes, such a union would be absolutely impossible. For, there are many things proper to God that imply a contradiction if communicated to a creature, such as to be uncreated, to be pure act, to be infinite being, and other similar things. Also there are certain things which, whether they could be communicated or not, it is certain they were not communicated to the humanity of Christ, such as to lack a beginning in time, to create heaven and earth, and the angels, and the other things that existed before the humanity of Christ. Also there are some things which, although they were bestowed on the humanity of Christ, but it was not done before the resurrection, like to be Impassible and immortal, and still before the resurrection there was the hypostatic union. And there is no validity whatsoever in the response of those who way that Christ, during the time of his emptying, had to hide his majesty. For, he did not hide those gifts, but he really did not have them, lest they say that the body of Christ was always immortal and impassible, which is another heresy proposed by Evagrius in book 4, chapters 38 and 39 of his History.

In the eighth place. They confess that these gifts belong to the humanity of Christ accidentally, as is evident from thesis 22 of Smidelinus. But the hypostatic union is not accidental but substantial, as is clear from the cited Councils, and especially from chapters 4 and 5 of the Fifth Council, where this is expressly stated. Likewise, because then Christ the man would be the Son of God by grace, not by nature, which of course is opposed to the teaching of all the Fathers. Also, man could not truly be called God, nor God a man; for, that accidental union does not take place through the inherence of the gifts, as they say and say rightly, because they are speaking about the uncreated gifts, which are the essence itself of God; but it is by an external joining together, such as exists between a principal agent and an instrument, as between a ship and a sailor. For, they teach that the union of God and man consists in the fact that God produces all things through that man. But a union of that kind is not sufficient in order to communicate names and properties. For, a sailor cannot be said to be a ship, nor a ship a sailor; therefore Christ the man cannot be said to be God, nor can Christ as God be said to be a man. And we will say this same thing about the properties; for, just as a sailor cannot be said to be lacking sense and reason, which are not the properties of a ship, and the ship cannot be said to be endowed with sense and reason, which are properties of a sailor; so also, Christ as God cannot be said to be crucified and dead, which properly belong to a man, nor can Christ the man be said to be omnipotent, and the Creator of heaven and earth, which are things proper to God.

Finally, if the hypostatic union were only that communication of accidental gifts, we also would be hypostatically united with God, although less closely. For, the fact that he has more gifts, and we fewer, does not change the species.

In addition, it is clear that they do not have a serious argument. The main one is that proposed by Brentius, and he repeats it often, namely, unless it is as he says, a distinction cannot be found between the union of God with the humanity of Christ, and the union of the same God with Peter and with other men, since God sustains all things, and is intimate to all things by his essence, presence and power, and this is the only difference that through the man Christ alone he produces all things.

But this argument is easily refuted. For, the difference consists in this, that the humanity of Christ does not have its own subsistence, but it exists in the Word, and to illustrate this Athanasius uses this similitude in the Creed when he says: *Just as the rational soul and flesh are one man, so God and man are one Christ.* But other men have their own subsistence and it is really different from that which is in the Word of God. Hence God sustains Peter in one way, and the flesh of Christ in another way. For, he is said to sustain Peter, because he conserves him with his essence and subsistence, as when someone holds a staff in his hand; but the Word of God sustains the humanity of Christ, in the way in which the whole sustains the parts intimately joined and united to itself.

CHAPTER IX

A QUESTION IS PROPOSED: WHETHER A REAL COMMUNICATION OF THE DIVINE ATTRIBUTES FOLLOWS FROM THE HYPOSTATIC UNION, AND ESPECIALLY IMMENSITY OR UBIQUITY

After we have shown that the hypostatic union does not consist in the communication of all the divine attributes, we still have to treat the question whether it at least follows from that union, that all the attributes, or just some of them, and in particular, omnipresence, is communicated to the humanity of Christ.

Now Kemnitius, in chapters 4,21 and 23 of his book on the two natures, teaches that that communication is not of the essence of the hypostatic union, and on this point he disagrees with Brentius and Smidelinus. However, he does say that such communication is a result of the hypostatic union, and that it is real, so that the human nature truly is omnipotent and omnipresent, etc.

Wigandus expresses a similar view in his book on the communication of idioms, except that he says certain properties are not communicated except verbally, such as to be the Creator of heaven and earth, because then the Son of God was not a man; but the others really, and in particular Ubiquity.

Nicolas Selneecerus also teaches similar things, both in his Pedagogy, and in his letter to the Theologians at Wittenberg, written in the year 1571, where he condemns this proposition as a blasphemy: *The human nature in Christ is not omnipotent.* And in the same place he teaches that infinite gifts were really communicated to the humanity of Christ by the hypostatic union. And he adds these words, by which he seems to confuse completely the properties of the natures: *That pertains to his power, we say with Paul, if we have known Christ according to the flesh, but now we do not know him. For, when the infirmity of the flesh ceased, now we know nothing in him except the power of the divinity.* And after that: *And because of that, whatever either was, or is and remains of the twofold substance, has become one power.*

Finally, all the Lutherans cited above at the beginning of this book defend this real communication, although they do not agree on whether it pertains to the essence of the hypostatic union, or only follows it as a result.

But the Catholic doctrine teaches two things. First, from the hypostatic union many created and infused gifts were conferred on the humanity of Christ, like outstanding grace, great wisdom, special powers, and other similar things. However, these are not attributes of the Godhead, except by a certain participation, just as we participate in the attributes of God through our created qualities, although less perfectly than the humanity of Christ participates in them. And the communication of idioms does not consist in these things; for, that communication is mutual, but the communication of these gifts is not mutual, for they add nothing to the Godhead.

Second, from the hypostatic union there follows the communication of idioms, which communication is not real with respect to the natures themselves, as if the Divinity itself became passible, and the humanity really became omnipotent, as the Lutherans

say; nor is it merely verbal, as Beza says in his book against Brentius, and Peter Martyr in the dialogue on the two natures, but it is indeed real, however with respect to the hypostasis of both natures: but not with respect to the natures themselves, as the Fathers teach expressly, like Ambrose in book 2, chapter 4 on Faith, Augustine in book 1, chapter 13 on the Trinity, Cyril in defense of the 4th anathema, and Damascene in book 3, chapter 4, where he says that for the idioms to be communicated is nothing other than for the properties of both natures to be applied to a common hypostasis, and therefore to the natures themselves in the concrete, because concrete names can be accepted for the suppositum, although formally they signify the natures.

Therefore we say correctly: God was born of the Virgin, suffered, died, etc., because the word "God" can be used for any divine suppositum, and therefore for the suppositum of the Second Person, who is at the same time both divine and human; this suppositum truly and really is God, and truly and really is man; and therefore truly and really he was born of the Virgin, suffered, died, etc. For a similar reason we say correctly: Christ the man is omnipotent, eternal, everywhere, etc., because the word "man" in the concrete stands for a human suppositum; but in Christ the divine suppositum is in one humanity, and since it is divine, consequently it is omnipotent, eternal and everywhere, etc. All of these things can be proved easily, but for the sake of clarity first we will treat the idioms in general, and then we will treat Ubiquity in particular.

CHAPTER X

THE REAL COMMUNICATION OF IDIOMS WITH RESPECT TO THE NATURES DOES NOT FLOW FROM THE HYPOSTATIC UNION

Therefore, that the attributes are not really communicated, or the idioms of one nature to the other nature in virtue of the hypostatic union, is taught first of all by the sacred Councils. For, at the Council of Chalcedon in session 5 we read: *The character proper to each of the two natures was preserved as they came together in one Person, etc.* The same thing is stated in Council VI in sessions 4 and 17, in canon 9 of at the Council of Pope Martin, and in letter 10 of St. Leo to Flavian. Moreover, in Council VI in session 17 and in the Council of Pope Martin in canons 10, 11, 12 and following, it is defined against the Monothelites that in Christ there are not only two natures with their own properties, but there are also two wills and operations not mixed together. Finally, in the letter of Pope Agatho, which was read at Council VI in session 4 and approved by the whole Council, we read that in Christ everything is doubled, that is, natures, properties, wills, operations, with the sole exception of the hypostasis which is one; and in the same place it is added that the two unmixed natures are gathered from the natural properties of the same natures. From this it follows that the properties also unmixed and distinct.

From these points we conclude that the opinion of the adversaries is erroneous in many ways. For first of all, if the things proper to one nature are really and truly communicated to the other nature, and vice versa, then the properties do not remain distinct and unmixed. For, how do they remain distinct, if the human nature has divine, and the divine nature has human properties? Likewise, if they are communicated, then they are no longer properties, but common qualities; for, how can that be proper, which is actually common? Similarly, the properties of these natures, for the most part are incompatible, that is, to be created and uncreated, finite and infinite, eveiywhere and not everywhere; therefore, if the divine nature received human properties, it is forced to lose its own; and if the human nature receives divine, it is forced to lose its own; therefore, how did the Incarnation take place, while preserving the properties of each nature?

Rightly, therefore, Augustine in sermon 191 on time, which is #3 on the Trinity, says the following: *We also condemn the blasphemy of those who try to assert that, from the lime of the assumed flesh, everything that belonged to the Divinity was given to the man; and again, what pertained to the humanity was transferred to God, so that, what no heresy has ever dare to say, it seems that with this confusion both substances are emptied, namely, both the Divinity and the humanity, and each having lost its own nature was changed into the other.*

The adversaries tiy to respond to this. First of all, Brentius says in his book on the majesty of the man Christ that the Council of Chalcedon is speaking only about the essential properties, which cannot be removed without the destruction of the essence, but that it is not speaking about the accidental properties, such as to be in place, to be corruptible, etc.

But this answer says something to the third consequence, but nothing to the first and second. For, to have finite potential, and majesty, and power are the properties

inseparable from a creature, for their contraries are an argument for an infinite essence; therefore, to attribute to the humanity, which is a creature and finite, infinite power and infinite majesty, so that it is not only in the whole world, but also could actually fill infinite worlds, as the Godhead can do, is simply to take away from the humanity its essential properties. But this is what they say; for, they say that the humanity of Christ is truly omnipotent, and everywhere, in the way in which God is such, who of course not only is in the whole world, but also could actually fill infinite worlds.

Moreover, it follows further that there are in the world two omnipotences, immense and infinite, namely, the Godhead and the humanity of Christ. But this is opposed to the Athanasian Creed and it is opposed to all the Scriptures. And they cannot respond that there is one omnipotence, and infinity, and immensity of those two natures, as there is one of the three Divine Persons. For, the omnipotence, and infinity and immensity of God is nothing other than his essence; therefore there cannot be the same immensity and omnipotence of the Godhead and of the humanity of Christ, unless it is the same essence of both natures, as it is the same essence of the three Persons. And so it always comes down to the same thing—that the natures in Christ are confused.

The authors of the Concordia in the repetition of the controversial articles and Kemnitius in chapters 21, 22 and 23 of the book on the two natures, teach that the properties of the humanity are not communicated actually to the Divinity, and therefore that the divine nature remains unchanged. Then they add that the divine properties are communicated actually to the humanity, but the properties are not taken away from God, nor mixed together, because the divine properties never become the natural and essential properties of the humanity, but they are communicated only through grace: as from the joining of soul and body the properties of the body do not become those which are of the soul, but they are communicated only to the body, because the soul dwelling in it does all things in it and through it.

Kemnitius adds the similitude of the glowing iron which, as we said above, Origen also used in book 2, chapter 6 of his principles, and Basil in his Oration on the Nativity of the Lord. With this example Kemnitius thinks that it is very clearly explained how that communication takes place, while saving the properties of both natures.

But this solution is not sufficient. First, if the human properties are not attributed to the divinity, it follows that there is no mutual communication of idioms, which is contraiy to all the Fathers, and especially against Damascene in book 4, chapter 3. What does this mean, that with this reasoning they are forced to depart from their own Luther, who clearly taught that the things said about the passion of the Lord must be attributed to the divinity?

Second, it is not true that God accomplished absolutely everything through the flesh. For, at least the immanent actions, such as the divine thinking and willing were not and are not through the flesh. Likewise, the raising up of the body of Christ from the dead was not done through the flesh, but through the Spirit of God, according to Rom. 8:11.

Thirdly, not all the attributes of God consist in some external operation, as is clear regarding Simplicity, Infinity, Wisdom, Power, Goodness; therefore, even if God performed all of his exterior works through the flesh, not on that account would he have communicated to it his own attributes. Moreover, even if the Godhead worked absolutely

everything through the humanity, and all of his attributes were put into action, still the humanity could not be said to be omnipotent, all-knowing, all-just, etc. For the epithets belonging to the principal cause do not belong to the instrument, otherwise when someone writes learnedly and wisely, the pen would be called learned and wise.

Finally, the similitude of the soul and the body works against them. For, the soul does not communicate to the body its own true properties, nor does the body do it to the soul. For, the body does not think, reason, deliberate, which activities are proper to the soul; on the other hand, the soul does not run, sit, hunger, thirst, which are proper to the body. Moreover, the whole soul is in the head, and still the same whole is in the foot, where the head is not, and vice versa.

Also the similitude of the incandescent piece of iron offers no help for Kemnitius; in fact, it clearly shows his ignorance. For, Kemnitius says that fire communicates to the iron its own power of burning and illuminating, not through informing if but through union, whereby the iron is penetrated totally by the fire; and he adds that the iron still retains its own properties, that is, natural hardness, blackness, coldness, although they are not apparent. But surely anyone who says this is lacking in common sense. For, setting aside the possibility of miracles and deception, heat and coldness, hardness and softness, whiteness and blackness, if they are not apparent and sensed do not exist. But who ever saw blackness in glowing iron? Who senses coldness? Who would say there is hardness in something which bends like wax?

But, Kemnitius said, if the fire is removed, then the blackness, coldness and harness appear; therefore also they were there before. I respond: if the fire is removed from the iron, gradually the heat and whiteness of the iron recede, which were not only produced in the iron by the fire, but the fire also preserved them. Therefore, when once again the coldness and blackness exist in the iron, it is not the appearance of what was hidden, but the return of what was absent.

Furthermore, what kind of a paradox is this—that fire should penetrate the whole iron, not by the produced heat, but by itself, and that the iron should shine and bum, not by the heat received from the fire, but by itself which is in the fire? For, in this way the substance of fire, without any miracle, will penetrate another substance, which even glorified bodies do not do unless it is by the divine power, as St. Thomas teaches in 4 Sent., d. 44, q. 2, a. 2. Moreover, in whatsoever way the iron may be penetrated intimately by the fire, certainly it will never be true to say that the iron bums, or shines, unless the iron itself is determined by qualities of heat and light inhering in it; but it will be necessary to say that the fire, which is in the iron, bums and shines. We can add to this—that in the glowing iron that communication of idioms is not perceived, which is perceived in the Incarnation. For, we do not say that the iron is fire, or that the fire is iron, as we do say that God is a man, and a man is God.

And there is no problem in the fact that the Fathers use this similitude, for they are not trying to show with this example the communication of idioms, or the whole mystery of the Incarnation, but just one of its conditions, namely, how the divinity is not changed by the Incarnation, and how humanity is greatly perfected. For, as the fire in the iron does not grow dark, does not grown cold, and is not consumed by rust, so also...etc. Now this suffices for the attributes in general.

CHAPTER XI

THE UBIQUITY OF THE HUMANITY OF CHRIST IS REFUTED, BECAUSE IT CONTRADICTS THE SCRIPTURES

Now in particular there will be a discussion about ubiquity, or rather about the denial of ubiquity. First of all, therefore, ubiquity is expressly opposed to the Scriptures, which say that the man Christ, by reason of his humanity, was in some place, and therefore he was not always everywhere. Thus in John 11:14-15: *Lazarus is dead; and for your sake I am glad that I was not there, so that you may believe.* And in John 6:24: *So when the people saw that Jesus was not there.* And in Matt. 28:6: *He is not here; for he has risen.*

But they respond to this that it is signified by these testimonies that Christ was not everywhere in a divine way. But also in the Eucharist the body of Christ is not there locally, and nevertheless, because he is really there, none of the Lutherans would dare to say absolutely that the body of Christ is not here, that is, in the Eucharist. Similarly, God is not in the world locally, and nevertheless someone would not be tolerated who says that God is not in heaven and is not on earth. Therefore, in the same way, if the humanity of Christ truly is everywhere, in whatever way he might be there, it will be completely false what the Scriptures say, *He is not here, I will not be there, etc.* But Scripture cannot be false; therefore the opinion of the adversaries is false. Moreover, the soul of Christ was not in the underworld locally, but spiritually; and still he was not always there, for he did not remain in the underworld (Acts 2:3 Iff.). Therefore, he is not really everywhere, not only locally, but not in any other way either.

Secondly, it is opposed to those Scriptures which say that God is everywhere, and in this way they distinguish him from all creatures. Thus in Jer. 23:24: *I fill heaven and earth,* and elsewhere. And in Ps. 139:7: *Whither shall I go from your Spirit? Or whither shall I flee from your presence?* Hence the Fathers from this attribute prove that the Holy Spirit is true God, not a creature, because it is written in Wis. 1:7: *The Spirit of the Lord has filled the world.*

See Ambrose in book 1, chapter 7 on the Holy Spirit, Jerome and Cassiodorus on Ps. 139, Cyril in book 7 on the Trinity, Basil in chapter 22 of his book on the Holy Spirit, Didymus in book 1 on the Holy Spirit, St. Fulgentius in chapter 8 of his book to Donatus, Vigilius on the dispute of Athanasius, Arius and Sabellius, Augustine in book 3, chapter 21 against Maximinus.

They respond that it is proper to God to be everywhere *per se*\ however, the same thing belongs to the humanity of Christ *per accidens,* because of his union with God. But this does not satisfy, for "to be everywhere" *per accidens* can be understood in two ways. Pῖ8ζ because the humanity of Christ truly is not everywhere, but it is said to be everywhere, because it is joined to the Word which is everywhere. Secondly, because really it is everywhere, but it does not have this from its own nature, but through the grace of God, which is an accident with respect to his human essence.

If they understand it in the first way, they are not speaking properly, and they do not have what they intend. They are not speaking properly, because that cannot be said

absolutely to be such, which is not such itself, but is joined to something that is such; otherwise the body could be said to be a spirit, because it is joined to the soul which is a spirit, and the eye would be in the heels, because it is joined to the soul which is in the heels. And they do not have what they intend; for, from ubiquity they want to establish the true presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist; but from that accidental ubiquity it does not follow that the body of Christ really is in the Eucharist, but it only follows that it is joined to the Godhead, which is present in the Eucharist.

If they accept it in the second way, as without doubt they do accept it, then the argument of the Fathers for the Holy Spirit surely collapses. For, the Arians will say that the Holy Spirit is indeed everywhere, but *per accidens;* and therefore he is not true God, but a creature. Therefore, since the Fathers rightly prove from ubiquity that the Holy Spirit is God, evidently it follows that truly to be everywhere pertains to God alone, and so it is not communicated to any creature through grace.

You will say: cannot the body of Christ, since it is in so many places sacramentally at the same time, also be in the whole world? Cannot God change the whole world into bread, and that bread into his own body? Nevertheless, even because of that, the body of Christ could not be God.

I respond that indeed that can happen, but this is not to be everywhere as God is, and as the Brentians understand it about the body of Christ. For, God is in the whole world, not as though he is contained by the world, but he is of such immensity that he could fill infinite worlds; that is something that we in no way attribute to the body of Christ, which is finite. Then, whatever the case may be about what he can or cannot do, it is enough for us that it has not been communicated to any creature that it should be everywhere, and therefore from that it is clearly proved that the Holy Spirit is God.

Thirdly, ubiquity is opposed to the testimonies by which the Fathers prove that there are two natures in Christ; the main one is found in John 3:13: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, the Son of man who is in heaven.* From this text many of the Fathers conclude that Christ is God and man, because when he was in the body alone on earth, he still said he is in heaven, that is, that he is God. Thus Augustine, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theophylact, Bede in their commentaries on this text. Likewise Nazianzen in letter 1 to Chelidon, and Hilary in book 10 on the Trinity, and others.

But if the opinion of the Ubiquitists were true, this argument would not be valid. For the Eutychians, having been taught by the Ubiquitists, said that Christ was then also with his flesh in heaven, and on earth, and everywhere.

Furthermore, the Fathers prove that Christ is God and man from those places, where Christ is said to travel and to change places, now by boat, now on foot, now also on a donkey; however, since as God he was everywhere, he could not be moved. See St. Ambrose in book 2, chapter 4 on Faith, and Athanasius in Vigilius concerning the dispute with Arius.

But according to the Ubiquitists all of that proves nothing. For, if the body of Christ was everywhere, certainly it could not be moved, unless it were metaphorically, as God is said at times to descend from heaven to earth, because he appears to men, not where

he was not, but where he was not seen. For, to be moved properly from place to place, is to leave one place and occupy another; but someone who is everywhere cannot leave one place, nor can he occupy another. And what they say is not valid: that the body of Christ is eveiywhere invisibly, but visibly in a certain place, and in this second way it could be moved. For, he cannot be in the same place visibly and invisibly at the same time, because then he would be in the same place twice. Then would that not involve a contradiction—that the same thing in the same place is seen and not seen?

Finally, "to be moved properly" cannot be understood without the acquisition of a new place. Therefore Christ, if he was everywhere, could not truly be moved, but only apparently; and therefore, just as from the metaphorical movement of God there is no proof that God is a creature, so from the movement of Christ, which could only be metaphorical, it could not be rightly deduced that Christ is human. And this is confirmed by the responses of the adversaries who, since they want to show that the movement of the body of Christ does not contradict his Ubiquity, prove what was also said about God in Gen. 11:7: *Let us go down and there confuse their language.* And in Gen. 18:21: *I will go down to see, etc.* For, Brentius in the book on the Majesty of the man Christ argues in this way. Therefore, they themselves confess that the humanity of Christ cannot be moved from place to place in any other way than God can be moved.

CHAPTER XII

THE UBIQUITY OF THE BODY OF CHRIST IS REFUTED, BECAUSE IT CONTRADICTS THE APOSTLES' CREED

Next, Ubiquity is opposed to the articles of the Creed on the Conception of Christ, the Nativity, Death, Burial, Descent into the underworld, Resurrection, Ascension and final Coming for judgment.

And first of all with his Conception; for, the Faith holds that the flesh of Christ was in the womb of Mary alone. But according to the Ubiquitists, immediately after the Conception that flesh was in the womb of all women, indeed of men too, and therefore that praise is common to all: *Blessed is the womb that bore you* (Luke 11:27). Likewise, Faith teaches that the body of Christ after nine months came forth from the womb into the light, and so was truly born; but according to the Ubiquitists, before the ninth month, indeed on the first day of his Conception he was outside the womb, and after the tenth month he was still in the womb, in fact he never exited from there.

They will say that he exited because locally he was in the womb, and not outside the womb; and afterwards locally he was outside the womb, and not in the womb. But the contrary is true, because that "being locally" seems to be nothing else but a certain appearance, just as it is when God, who is everywhere, appears in a certain place. For, if the true flesh of Christ after the Conception was present in every place, it could not truly go to some place, but only be manifested, as we said above, where before it was not seen. The Nativity, therefore, was not true, but only apparent, as the Manicheans said.

Similarly, the Faith requires that in death the body of Christ was separated from the soul, and that the body remained in the sepulcher, and the soul descended into the underworld. But according to the ubiquitists, in the sepulcher the soul was also with the body, and the body was with the soul in the underworld.

We do not want to spend too much time on this proof, but the authors of the Concordia in the repetition of article nine say that they believe that, after the burial of Christ, the whole person—God and man—descended into the underworld; but certainly if the man descended into the underworld, it was not the soul alone that descended.

Likewise the Faith hands on that the body of Christ, after three days, returned from death to life, and departed from the closed tomb, and entered where the disciples were (the doors being closed); these things are reported by the Evangelists as being miracles. But according to the Ubiquitists, Christ never departed from the sepulcher, and he did not go in to be with the disciples, but only manifested himself outside the sepulcher, although he remained there invisibly. And what John writes about the entrance of Christ to be with the disciples, the doors being closed, is in no way astonishing, since he did not truly enter, though the doors were closed, but he only made himself visible in that place, where he was invisibly; nevertheless Brentius stresses this miracle against the Zwinglians in his book on the Majesty of the man Christ; and the same things are said in the book on Concordia at page 718.

Finally, the Faith holds that Christ ascended into heaven, and from there he will

come to judge; but according to the Ubiquitists, he neither ascends or descends.

They respond to this matter of the Ascension, in the article of the Creed about his Ascension into heaven, by saying that the name of heaven is to be taken figuratively, not properly, and that it signifies only the glory, kingdom and majesty of God, but not some certain place. And Illyricus proves this in his book on the Ascension of Christ. First, from the words of Peter in Acts 3:21 : (Jesus) *whom heaven must receive;* for, if the report were about a place, it would have said: *who must be received by heaven.*

Secondly, he proves it from the Creed itself; for the meaning of *He ascended into heaven* is explained by the following words, *and sits at the right hand of the Father.* But these are metaphorical words; for the Father does not really have a right or a left hand. Therefore also the ascension into heaven should be taken metaphorically.

Thirdly, if Christ truly ascended into this corporeal heaven, he should have permitted, indeed commanded his disciples to see how he ascended to the highest heaven, and by ascending passed through the stars of heaven so that they could bear witness to it to the whole world, which however did not take place. And he adds, in his usual way of speaking obscurely, and still triumphantly: *Really this is clearly an irrefutable demonstration against their locating Christ residing in heaven.*

Brentius in his book on the two natures of Christ and his Ascension proves the same thing. First, because Christ is said to have ascended above all the heavens. Thus in Eph. 4:10: *He who ascended far above all the heavens.* And Heb. 4:14: *He has passed through the heavens.* Therefore, Brentius said, he did not remain in any one place. And Heb. 7:26: *He is exalted above the heavens.* Therefore, Christ is not in heaven as in a place.

Second, because if he were in a corporeal heaven, he would have to be at the South Pole in the Antarctic, for he should be in a quiet place, otherwise he would be very uncomfortable in a state of perpetual motion, for only the poles are immobile. Therefore, he should be at one of the poles, and to be at the center of it. However, according to Aristotle, the South Pole is superior, and the North Pole is inferior. Therefore, Christ should be located at the South Pole. And he confirms this by saying, because if he were in the corporeal heaven, where would be betake himself, when heaven is destroyed? So in this way it delights the sons of darkness to play, and to make jokes about the mysteries of Christ.

Third, he proves it in another book on the Majesty of Christ, because Christ ascended into the heaven from which he descended. He cites John 3:13: *No one has ascended into heaven but he who descended from heaven, etc.;* but he descended from a corporeal heaven; therefore he did not ascend into a corporeal heaven; but just as he is said metaphorically to have descended, when *he emptied himself,* so he is said metaphorically to have ascended, when *God highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name which is above every name.*

But Catholics believe that Christ ascended into the true corporeal heaven, whether he remains within that heaven, as St. Augustine seems to think in letter 57 to Dardanus, where at the end of the letter he says that Christ is everywhere as God, and in some part of heaven because of the nature of his true body, or whether he remains above and outside of all the heavens, so that with his feet he touches the peak of the highest heaven, as St.

Thomas says in III, q. 57, a. 4. But these things are not certain, and it is not necessary to know them. In fact, Augustine also warns in chapter 6 on Faith and the Creed that it is unnecessary to raise questions about them.

But it is certain that the body of Christ now is visible and palpable, and that it occupies as much space as the mass of a body, and that he is in the corporeal heaven, either inside of it, as someone is said to be in a house, or above it, as someone is said to be on the roof. And it is proved first of all, because Christ ascended into that heaven, where the throne of God is; but that is a corporeal heaven, as is clear from Ps. 113: *The heaven of heavens belongs to the Lord, but he gave the earth to the sons of men.* Since there heaven is opposed to earth, and the earth is properly understood as the corporeal one upon which we tread, certainly also heaven should be understood properly. Thus in Isa. 66:1: *Heaven is my throne and the earth is my footstool.* Likewise in Matt. 5:34: *Do not swear either by heaven, for it is the throne of God, or by the earth, for it is his footstool.* And in chapter 6:9: *Our Father who art in heaven.* And after that: *Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.* You see everywhere that heaven is called the throne of God and it is always opposed to the earth, which we inhabit. This antithesis clearly teaches that the corporeal heaven which we perceive above us is the throne of God, and therefore that Christ ascended to this heaven.

In the second place, the same is proved from the history of the ascension, which is so described in the Scriptures that it cannot in any way be changed into a figure of speech, unless someone clearly wants to be impudent. Thus in Acts 1:9: *As they were looking on,* Luke said, *he was lifted up, and a cloud took him out of their sight.* Up to this point there is no place for a metaphor; for, the Apostles saw him going up to the clouds, which seems to be corporeal, unless perhaps they are making Christ into a deceiver. But that the terminus or end of that true movement was not the clouds, is made clear in Luke 24:51: *We he blessed them,* Luke said, *he parted from them and was carried up into heaven.* But that Christ truly arrived at the place to which he was going is reported in Mark 16:19: *So then the Lord Jesus,* Mark said, *after he had spoken to them, was taken up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God.* Therefore the Evangelists narrate the beginning, progress and end of the ascension. The beginning was true and proper, not metaphorical, not imaginary; therefore also the progress and end were true and proper; therefore Christ truly and properly ascended into heaven.

In the third place, it is proved from the descent from heaven for the judgment; for, he will descend for judgment from that heaven into which he ascended, as is stated in Acts 1:11: *He will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven.* And Matt. 24:30: *Then will appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven;* 1 Thess. 1:16: *The Lord himself will descend from heaven with a cry of command with the archangels call;* 2 Thess. 1:7: JIta *the Lord Jesus is revealed from heaven.* But it is certain that the Lord is not going to come down from heaven metaphorically, so that to descend from heaven is for him to relinquish his glory, kingdom and majesty, but rather that he will appear in great majesty and power. Therefore the heaven from which he will descend, is not the kingdom and the majesty, but a certain place; therefore he also ascended to that certain place.

In the fourth place, it is proved from the place of the Saints. For, there is the man

Christ, where saintly men are and will be. Thus in John 14:2ff.: *In my Father ÿ house are many rooms; if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you? And when I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again and will take you to myself, that where I am you may be also.* But the Saints will not be everywhere, but in a certain place, and if in a certain place, certainly in a beautiful one, that is, in heaven; therefore also Christ the man is in that place, and will be.

Finally, this is the opinion of all the Saints and especially of Augustine in letter 57 to Dardanus, where he urges him to ponder the Creed and simply to believe that Christ the man after his true resurrection really ascended into heaven, and that he is there in a certain place. And in chapter 6 of the book on Faith and the Creed he writes, although the Gentiles wonder how the body of Christ could be in heaven, nevertheless it is really to be believed; and he teaches the same thing in chapter 25 of his book on the agony of Christ. The reasons alleged against this do not prove anything.

To the first argument of Illyricus I say that the statement of Peter is veiy ambiguous both in Greek and in Latin, but in whatever way it may be explained, the consequence is not what Illyricus says. For, if we read, *whom heaven must receive,* so that the meaning is, *It is necessary that heaven receive Christ,* as a designated place, then the sentence is in our favor. But if the meaning is, *It is necessary that Christ receive heaven,* then also it will not be against us. For, in order for Christ to receive heaven, it is not necessary that Christ be diffused throughout the whole heaven, but it is enough, that he be in some part of heaven, as a king is said to receive the kingdom, or the royal palace, or the throne of kings, when he begins to be in the kingdom, or in the palace, or on the throne, even if he is not actually present in the whole kingdom, or on the throne, or in the palace.

However, the first explanation is more in conformity with the text; for, it says: *Whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all that God spoke, etc.;* there the taking possession of the kingdom is not indicated, which happens in a moment, but remaining in the place, which lasts for a long time, and Oecumenius explains it in this way. It is also more in conformity with other texts, which say that Christ was assumed or raised up to heaven, as in Mark 16 and Acts 1, and that he has gone into heaven in 1 Pet. 3:22.

Concerning his second reason, I deny that it is the same thing to ascend into heaven and to sit at the right hand of God. For, in the Creed nothing should be repeated, since it is a very brief summary. But we will explain later the meaning of the expression "to sit at the right hand of the Father."

Concerning the third reason of Illyricus, I say that it was not necessary that the Apostles should see Christ rising above all the heavens; for, if we do not have their testimony about this matter, we do have the testimony of the angels, who in Acts 1:11 clearly say that Christ was assumed into heaven and that he would come again in the same way for judgment. Actually, it was more suitable that they not see the conclusion of his ascension, both lest they might think it was an illusion, since naturally human vision cannot reach so far, and so that Faith might have its place in them. Also, just as they did not see Christ being incarnated, or born, or rising from the dead, and they did not see him die, except for John, and nevertheless they were the future preachers and the first and

principal witnesses of all the mysteries of the Christian Faith.

To the first reason of Brentius I say that therefore the opinion of St. Thomas is proved, namely, that the body of Christ was raised above the highest heaven, but not that his person is nowhere visible. Although the opinion of St. Thomas based on those texts is not fully convincing, it can be responded that Christ ascended above all the heavens, and was made higher than the heavens, and passed through all the heavens, because he is in the highest part of the last heaven, and so he has under his feet the highest heaven for the most part. Indeed Heb. 4:14 favors the opinion of Augustine, for Paul in that text is alluding to the Aaronic high priest, who once a year passed through the interior veil of the Holy of Holies, but he did not go beyond that. Therefore also the Lord as the heavenly high priest entered into the intimate part of the highest heaven, but he did not go beyond that, and he did not remain outside heaven itself.

To the second reason I say that those words of Brentius are idle, not to say blasphemous, since he makes a joke out of the divine mysteries. But so that those jokes cause no harm, we respond that the body of Christ was not reduced to the poverty of the South Pole, but it is wherever he wants it to be; and there is no danger of activity, since the empyrean heaven is said to be quiet and peaceful by all; and that is not going to be destroyed, although the lower heavens are to be changed in some way. But all of these things surpass the power of understanding in this life. With Augustine at the end of his book, *The City of God,* it is enough to know that in heaven the glorious bodies both in motion and in rest will function as they desire, and it will be totally fitting.

To the third reason I say that Christ ascended to the heaven from which he descended, and that he descended from the true heaven, although the descent itself was metaphorical. But from that it does not follow that his ascent must be explained metaphorically, if the descent was metaphorical; for, the descent was of the spiritual, immense and uncreated Word, while the ascent was of the corporeal, created and finite body.

CHAPTER XIII

UBIQUITY IS REFUTED, BECAUSE IT IS OPPOSED TO THE PRESENCE OF THE BODY OF THE LORD IN THE EUCHARIST

In the third place, Ubiquity conflicts with the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and it was proposed as a way of defending it. For, if the body of Christ is everywhere, certainly we do not need the Eucharist, and we go in vain to Churches, in vain we recite the words of consecration, in vain we prepare for the Eucharist, since at home we have the body of Christ in the bread and wine, and in all other foods.

Luther says in his book that the words of Christ, *This is my body* still remain valid, and presents this argument to himself in the following words: *If the body of Christ is in all places, well then I will devour him, and guzzle him in all dinners, and in every dish, cup and goblet.* Then he answers himself in this way: *Listen, you pig, you wild dog, or whoever you are, you foolish ass, even if the body of Christ is in all places, nevertheless you will not immediately devour or guzzle him down.* And after that he says: *I am going to remove you from your pig-sty or your dung-pit.* The point of his response is this: although he is everywhere, still he cannot be grasped everywhere. He gives an example of the rays of the sun, which touch us on all sides; nevertheless, if someone wants to capture them in a box, and take them with him, he cannot do it.

But this solution is not valid. For, if the body of Christ truly is everywhere, it cannot be separated from any thing, and therefore it is impossible that I should have bread on the table, or in my hand, or in my mouth, or in my stomach, and not have there the body of Christ. And the example of the sun's rays is not valid, because the rays are not only not everywhere, but they also cannot penetrate bodies that are not transparent.

John Brentius, in his book on the two natures and the Ascension of Christ, responds somewhat differently, or rather explains the opinion of Luther. For he says that the body of Christ is everywhere personally, but in the Eucharist he is also there definitively, that is, from the definition and decree of God through the consecration; this way of being adds only efficacy, for in the Eucharist Christ is received efficaciously, and nowhere else.

This solution clearly includes Calvinism; for, Brentius is forced to say that nothing is received in the Eucharist that is not had outside the Supper, except the efficacy of the body of Christ; and therefore that in the Eucharist the body of Christ is not really received, but only some of his energy. And although Brentius does not say this, still it evidently follows from the Ubiquity. For just as, because God is everywhere, he cannot be moved, either per *se,* or *per accidens;* and therefore no one eating bread can truly be said to eat God, although God is in the bread; for, I truly eat bread, because the bread passes from my hand to my mouth, from my mouth to my stomach; but God does not move in this way, because he is at the same time in my hand, in my mouth, in my stomach, and everywhere; so also, if the body of Christ is everywhere, it cannot truly be eaten with bread, because it cannot really go with the bread from hand to mouth, from mouth to stomach, because it cannot be moved, since it already is everywhere. Therefore in the Supper the body of Christ is present and eaten through eneigy, and not through a real reception.

You see now how the Lutherans and Brentians, while they oppose the Calvinists, really favor them, and still Brentius in his Testament curses the Sacramentarians, and he does not allow any place to be given to them in the Church.

CHAPTER XIV

UBIQUITY IS REFUTED BY THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS

Finally, Ubiquity is in conflict with all the Fathers. St. Ambrose in book 2, chapter 4 of his book on Faith said: *For God does not move from place to place, who is always everywhere; as a man, he is one who goes, he is one who comes, and finally somewhere says: Rise, let us go. Therefore, he goes and comes according to what he has in common with us.* Cyril of Jerusalem said in #14 of his Catechism: *Just because now he is not present in the flesh, do not think that he is not present in spirit in our midst, hearing what they say about him, and seeing what you think, and searching hearts and minds.* Ruffinus on the Creed: *Therefore he ascended,* he said, *into heaven, not where the Word of God was not before, since he was always in heaven, but where the Word made flesh before that was not sitting.*

Augustine in tractate 78 on John said: *But from whom the man departed, God did not abandon, and the same Christ is man and God. Therefore, he departed by that which he was as man, and remained by what he was as God. He departed by that by which he was in one place, he remained through that by which he was everywhere.* And in letter 57 to Dardanus: *But it does not follow,* he said, *that what is in God, is therefore everywhere as God. For, also Holy Scripture says about us that in him we live, and move and have our being; however, like him we are not everywhere, but man is in God in one way, and God is in man in another way, each in his own proper way. For, God and man is one person, and both are one Jesus Christ; he is everywhere through what he is as God, but he is in heaven through what he is as man.*

Cyril of Alexandria in book 11 of his commentary on John 21 said: *The disciples thought that the absence of Christ, I am speaking of him as a man (for as God he is present everywhere), would be the cause of many problems for them, since he was not present, who could protect them from all evils; but it was necessary for them to consider not only the flesh of Christ but also his Divinity, which although it is not seen with the eyes, still is always present with absolute power; and there is nothing that can prevent him from filling all things and from going wherever he wishes. For, the divine nature is not hemmed in by place or physical dimensions. Therefore since Christ truly is both God and man, it was necessary for them to understand that he would always be with them with the ineffable power of his Divinity, even if he was absent in the flesh.*

Theodoretus in Dialogue 2 said: *Therefore the body of the Lord indeed rose free from corruption and ruin—impassible, immortal, and glorified with divine glory, and he is adored by the heavenly powers; however there is a body, and it has the circumscription which it had previously.* And in Dialogue 3 he said: *But after the resurrection he was seen to be circumscribed, and having hands and feet and other parts of the body; he could be touched, and he could be seen clearly, and he had wounds and cuts as before the resurrection. Therefore it is necessary to say one of two things, either that the divine nature has these parts, or confess that the body remained in the limits of its own nature.*

Leo in Sermon 2 on the Ascension said: *Through his Ascension, in an ineffable* wog

he began to be more present in his divinity, who was made more distant in his humanity. Gregory in homily 29, which is on the Ascension, said this: *He returned to where he was, and from there he came back where he now remains, because when he ascended into heaven with his humanity, by his divinity he contained both heaven and earth.* Vigilius in book 1 against Eutyches said: *But he is with us and he is not with us, because whom he left, and from whom he departed in his humanity, he did not leave, and he did not forsake them in his divinity. For, through the form of a servant, which he took from us to heaven, he is absent from us, but through the form of God, which did not depart from us on earth, he is present to us.* And in book 4 he said: *Then if there is one nature of the Word and of the flesh, since the Word is everywhere, why is it that the flesh is not found everywhere? For when he was on earth, he was not indeed in heaven, and now because he is in heaven, he is certainly not on earth.*

Fulgentius in book 2, chapter 17 for Trasimundus said this: *He was one and the same according to his human substance when he was absent from heaven and was on earth, and leaving the earth when he ascended into heaven; but according to his divine and immense substance, he did not leave heaven when he came down from heaven, nor did he abandon earth when he ascended into heaven.*

Kemnitius responds to these testimonies in chapter 30 of his book on the two natures, and he has much to say. First, he says that the Ancients are speaking against the Manicheans and Eutychians, who say that the humanity of Christ was changed into the immense divinity which is not fixed in any place. Second, he says that the Fathers wanted to say that the humanity of Christ is not everywhere according to its natural properties. Third, that the Fathers did not want the humanity of Christ to be diffused eveiywhere according to its visible form, and that it is now on earth neither locally, nor circumscriptively, nor sensibly.

But all of these reasons are trivial. For, with regard to the first reason: it is indeed true that the Fathers are speaking against the Eutychians, but they refute them with this argument, because, since the flesh of Christ is not everywhere like the divinity, they must necessarily be of different natures; therefore those who deny the foundation of the Fathers, and say that the body of Christ is everywhere, openly oppose the Fathers, and therefore are refuted by the Fathers.

Likewise, the second reason is veiy weak. For, the Fathers do not dispute about the natural properties of the body, but simply deny that it is everywhere. Indeed, Augustine in his letter to Dardanus explicitly treats what is fitting for the flesh not of itself, but from its union with the Word; and he very clearly declares that it does not follow, that if the Word is eveiywhere, then the flesh united to it is also everywhere.

The third reason is also not solid, both because no one can doubt about whether the flesh of Christ is diffused everywhere visibly, and because the Fathers also do not opposed visible flesh to invisible flesh, but they oppose the flesh to the divinity, and they say that Christ according to his divinity is everywhere, according to his flesh he is not everywhere.

CHAPTER XV

THE ARGUMENT OF THE HERETICS IS ANSWERED

Now the arguments of the adversaries must be answered, which are taken partly from the Scriptures and partly from the testimonies of the Fathers and the Scholastics.

They derive the first and principal argument from the right hand of God. For, Christ as man is exalted at the right hand of God the Father: Matt. 26:64, Acts 2:33, Eph. 1:20, Col. 3:1,1 Pet. 3:22, Heb. 1:3, and elsewhere. But the right hand of God is everywhere, for it is not a corporeal right hand, which can be located in a certain place; therefore Christ as man is not in some certain place, but he is everywhere.

I respond with three answers. First, if "being at the right hand of God" is taken in a crass way, as Luther does in his book on the words of the Lord, *This is my body,* where he proves that the body of Christ is everywhere, because it is at the right hand of God, and not in his little finger or in the tip of his right hand—then I reply that it does not follow logically. For, the souls of the just are also said to be in the hand of God (Wis. 3:1), and doubtless they are not at the end of his finger, but in his whole hand. And for a similar reason the hand of God is everywhere, and nevertheless on account of that the souls of the just are not eveiywhere. The reason for this is that the hand of God is not everywhere by extension, as if part were here and part were there, but the whole is here and the whole is there.

Secondly I say that by "the right hand of God" eternal beatitude is understood by many commentators, but not the majesty or divine power. In this way Jerome explains it in his comments on Eph. 1 and Augustine in chapter 7 of his book on Faith and the Creed, and in chapter 26 of his book on the agony of Christ; he says that Christ not only wants to sit at the right hand of God, and also all the elect to sit at the right hand of God, according what is said in Eph. 2:6, *He made us sit with him in the heavenly places.* And in Matt. 25:33 the sheep are said to be in the future at the right hand.

And this opinion can be confirmed from the fact that among the ancients to sit at the right hand was less honorable than to sit on the left, as Anthony Nebrissensis points out and proves with many testimonies in his explanation of fifty places of Scripture. Hence in the lead seals of the Pontiffs, and in many ancient images, Peter is placed at the left hand, but it is certain that the first place was always given to Peter.

Therefore, if Christ as less and inferior sits on the right hand, therefore that sitting should not be referred to his divine majesty, in which the Son is equal to the Father, but to the human glory and beatitude, which is suitable for Christ as less than the Father; and according to this explanation the argument of the heretics has no value. For, to be in this way at the right hand of God does not require Ubiquity, but only beatitude, which he also can have who dwells in the smallest comer of the world.

Thirdly I say that it is more probable that at the right hand of God, where Christ is seated, his glory, power and divine majesty should be understood, so that the meaning of the article is—Christ is seated at the right hand of the Father, that is, with the same power and honor he reigns, judges and governs all things with his Father, so that the right hand

is taken simply for the side, that is, for an equal place, not superior or inferior. For, in Ps. 110 as the Son is said to be at the right hand of the Father, so later the Father is said to be at the right hand of the Son: *The Lord is at your right hand, he will shatter kings on the day of his wrath* (verse 5). From this it is clear that the right hand signifies equality.

Furthermore, almost all the Fathers explain it in this way: Athanasius in Sermon 2 against Arius, Basil in chapter 6 of his book on the Holy Spirit, Cyril of Jerusalem in the Catechism 14, Cyril of Alexandria in book 12, chapter 7 of his theses, Damascene in book 4, chapter 2, Leo in Sermons 1 and 2 on the Ascension. Finally, Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylact, Oecumenius on Heb. 1 and Eph.l, Ambrose in book 2, chapter 4 on Faith and in his comments on Eph.l, and others.

Then the Scriptures indicate the same thing. For, in Matt. 22:44 Christ quotes the verse in Ps. 110:1: *The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand,* to prove his divinity, and his true equality with the Father. And this same testimony of the Psalm is quoted by Paul to prove Christ's divinity, when he says in Heb. 1:3ff.: *He sat down at the right hand of the Majesty on high, having become as much superior to angels as the name he has obtained is more excellent than theirs. For to what angel did God ever say... sit at my right hand?*

And what Augustine cites from Eph. 2:6, *He made us sit with him in the heavenly places,* is no solid proof against this opinion. For the meaning is not that we are all going to sit at the right hand of God in our own proper persons, but we will in Christ, as Paul says; for otherwise the whole Scripture attributes to Christ alone to sit at the right hand of the Father.

And according to this explanation the argument of the heretics seems to have some validity. For, that sitting at the right hand of the Father, which signifies power and majesty, was given to the humanity of Christ, as is clear from Acts 2:33, *Being exalted at the right hand of God, etc.,* and Eph. 1:20, *He made him sit at his right hand.* For, it is not fitting for the Divinity to be exalted and to be placed at the right hand. Ruffinus also when explaining the Creed says it was given to the humanity, that it might be raised to the right hand of God, and St. Leo in Sermons 1 and 2 on the Ascension of Christ says that the humanity was elevated to the throne of the Father, and to participation in his glory. Theodoretus also on Ps. 110 and on Heb. 1 says that "sit at my right hand" was said to the humanity, for the Word did not need the command of the Father in order to sit.

Since that is so, it seems now that it cannot be denied that the humanity itself is endowed with divine majesty, and therefore also is everywhere. I respond that that sitting was given to the humanity, but was given to it not in itself, but to the suppositum. For, it did not happen that the humanity in itself sits at the right hand of God, but that it is the humanity of the person who sits at the right hand of God; just as it did not happen through the Incarnation that the human is God, but that it is the humanity of God. And therefore in the concrete it can be said—that man is God and he sits at the right hand of God, and there is a fitting similitude concerning the purple of a king. For when a king clothes himself in purple and sits on his throne, he raises the purple to that throne, not in such wise that the purpl e is said to sit and reign, but so that it is called the clothing of the one sitting and reigning, and also so that the purple clad king is said to sit and reign. However,

although this took place in the Incarnation, still Christ is said to have sat at the right hand of God after the Ascension, because then for the first time the glory and majesty of this man was made known perfectly, as is said in Phil. 2:9-11.

But that the matter is like that can be proved easily. Since according to this explanation by the right hand is understood the equality of honor and power, nevertheless the humanity neither is nor can be equal to God. For, since the Lord in John 14:28 says, *The Father is greater than I,* without doubt he understands that to be because of the humanity; and in 1 Cor. 15:28 the Apostle writes that even after the day of judgment the Son will be subject to Him, *When all things are subjected to him;* but this subjection cannot, as we said above, be rightly understood, unless it is by reason of the humanity.

Finally, if the humanity is a creature, does it not involve a contradiction if it is, or is said to be equal to the Creator? But they respond that the humanity of Christ is not absolutely equal to God, and nevertheless he sits at his right hand; he does not have the power and majesty of God, which is to sit at the right hand of God, and still because it does not have that from itself, as God has it, it does have it from God; because of this it cannot be made equal to God in every way.

But this view is easily refuted. For, to have something from another does not produce inequality; for, the Son of God has everything from the Father, but still he is truly and properly equal to him. They respond that the Son has it naturally, but the humanity has it through grace. But that is not so, for to have something through grace, is not to have the majesty itself, but only a certain participation in it, which does not suffice to constitute the sitting which we were speaking about.

Finally, the humanity is either truly equal to God, or it is not. If it is, then Jesus' statement is false, *The Father is greater than I,* and also this one, *The Son will also be subjected to him who put all things under himself.* If it is not, then the humanity of Christ does not sit at the right hand in this third way, but only in the second way; and ubiquity does not follow from that, as we already proved above.

CHAPTER XVI

OTHER OBJECTIONS TAKEN FROM THE WORD OF GOD ARE ANSWERED

They take the second argument from two places. For, in Phil. 2:5ff. we read that Christ is in the glory of God the Father. But what the glory of God the Father is is described in Isa. 40:12, where it is said about God: *Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand and marked off the heavens with a span?* And in 2 Chron. 2:6: *Heaven, even highest heaven, cannot contain him.* And in Jer. 23:24: *I fill heaven and earth.* Therefore, Jesus Christ holds the earth in the palm of his hand, and heaven is measured by his hand, and he fills heaven and earth, and that means to be everywhere.

I respond as above that the glory of God the Father was given to the humanity of Christ, not in itself, but in the suppositum, that is, through the grace of union the humanity of Christ received the gift that it should be the nature of the Son of God; and therefore that the man Christ is in the glory of the Father, and holds the earth in the hollow of his hand, and that he fills heaven and earth.

The third argument is taken from Matt. 11:27: *All things have been delivered to me by my Father;* and Matt. 28:18: *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me.* In this text "all authority" signifies omnipotence in heaven and omnipresence on earth; therefore Christ, being truly present, governs all things.

Brentius and Kemnitius add this from Ps. 8:6: *You have put all things under his feet.* And also John 13:3: *The Father gave all things into his hands.* From that they keenly conclude that Christ as man contains all things under his feet and in his hands. And lest perhaps a response is given that omnipotence and omnipresence, as infinite properties, cannot be communicated to a finite creature, they add secondly that power on earth of forgiving sins was given to Christ (Matt. 9:6), and that this is an infinite power: for, who can forgive sins, but God alone?

I respond that the first two texts can be understood in two ways. First, concerning the divine power which the Son of God received from the Father through his eternal generation; and these two texts are beside the point. Secondly, concerning the divine power which the human nature received through the hypostatic union, and then the response is the same as that given to the first argument. Thirdly, the last text can be understood to be about the power conferred on the humanity of Christ over all creatures, which however is not absolute omnipotence, nor does it require omnipresence. For, by those words it is only signified that the humanity of Christ is above all creatures, and has a certain right over all of them. From this it does not follow that he could do whatever God can do, or that he is everywhere. For why could he not have a right over something absent? Do we not observe among men as an ordinary thing that a king has power over his whole kingdom, and nevertheless by his presence he occupies only a small part of his palace, or only one room?

To their first confirmation I respond that the perversity and shamelessness is amazing of those who invent metaphors, where they are not at all necessary, and where they should be admitted they deny them. For what is better known or more normal than to understand

power as exercised through hands? For what else is meant in Ps. 95:4: *In his hand are the depths of the earth.* And in John 10:28: *And no one shall snatch them out of my hand.* Likewise, what is better known or more usual than to describe the power of dominion through the expression "subjection under his feet"? You can add to this that the words in Ps. 8, even if they are understood in particular about Christ, still they could also be understood to be about the first creation of man, which is described in Genesis, and still it is certain that Adam did not touch the whole world with his feet, although about him it is said, *You subjected all things under his feet,* unless perhaps we are captivated by Jewish fables. For Rabbi Solomon writes in his commentary on Deut. 4 that Adam was of such great height that he touched heaven with his head.

To the second confirmation I respond: if it concludes something, from that it could be deduced also that other men are everywhere. For, in John 20:23 Christ gave power to the disciples to forgive sins; therefore, if one can forgive sins in any way, and so can be everywhere, certainly the Apostles and their successors could be everywhere. Therefore I say: to forgive sins on one's own authority is an act of infinite power; but to forgive sins as the instrument of another does not require infinite power, as is obvious. Therefore, Christ as God forgave sins on his own authority; but the same Christ as man forgave them as an instrument of the divinity.

The fourth argument is based on Matt. 18:20: *Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* And in 28:20: *I am with you always, to the close of the age.* I respond that these things are said about Christ inasmuch as he is present to his own through his grace, and for this physical presence is not required, as is clear. For, in this way, whereby Christ is present to those gathered in his name, certainly he is not present to those gathered in the name of foreign gods; therefore, from these texts not only is it not concluded that he is everywhere, but it is deduced that he is not everywhere.

The fifth argument is based on John 5:21: *The Son gives life to whom he will.* Similarly: *The Father judges no one, but has given all judgment to the Son, that all many honor the Son, even as they honor the Father.* For from this we see that three divine powers have been conferred on Christ, namely, the power of judging, the power of vivifying, and a majesty worthy of the highest honor. The same reason applies to all the other powers; therefore all the others are conferred on him, and therefore omnipotence and omnipresence. And in order to avoid a response that these things were given to the Son because he is God, this is added in the same place: *He has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man.* And Brentius confirms this from Cyril in chapters 7 and 28 of his book on the Incarnation, where he says that the Word communicated to his flesh the operations of his majesty; and Leo has something similar in letter 83 to the Monks in Palestine.

I respond that this place can be understood in three ways. First, that all the things which are said here to have been given to Christ by the Father are understood to have been given to the Word by his eternal generation. For that is how Chrysostom understands this place; he says that the expression "because he is the Son of man" should be joined to what follows, and not with what precedes, so that we do not read it in this way: *He has given him authority to execute judgment, because he is the Son of man,* but rather like

this: *Because he is the Son of man, do not marvel at this,* that is, do not be amazed if I, since I am the Son of man, still say that I have the power of vivifying, and of judging, and must be honored like the Father, for I am not just the Son of man, but also the Son of God.

Secondly, it can be understood for the reason that all of those things are said to have been given to the humanity, not in itself, but in the suppositum, and that it was done by the grace of union, as we said above about the sitting at the right hand; Augustine and Cyril seem to have understood it in this way. From their explanation it does not follow that the humanity of Christ has it itself formally the divine attributes, but only that it is the nature of his suppositum which has those attributes.

Thirdly, it can be understood in the sense that it is dealing with the power of judging, not in any way whatsoever, but exteriorly and sensibly; indeed this power was given to Christ, because he is the Son of man. For, since a judge of men must be seen in an exterior judgment by those who are being judged, so God the Father, who is invisible, will not judge, but he will give judgment to the Son, who because of his assumed flesh was made visible.

In confirmation of this I say that Leo and Cyril in those places explain the communication of idioms in the way in which we have explained them above, so that it is real with respect to the suppositum, but verbal with respect to the natures.

For, in that place Leo and Cyril teach that this communication is mutual, so that also the human nature will have communicated its passions to the Word, and still they say in the same place that the nature of the divine Word is totally impassible.

The sixth argument is based on Col. 2:9: *In Christ the wholefidlness of deity dwells bodily.* Similarly: *In him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* But if the whole fullness of divinity has been communicated to the humanity of Christ, certainly also omnipotence and omnipresence.

I respond that it is one thing for the fullness of the divinity to be communicated to the humanity, and the treasures of wisdom, which Paul does not say; and it is something else for the divinity to dwell in the humanity of Christ, and for the treasures of wisdom to be hidden there, which Paul does say. For, that first statement would mean that the humanity of Christ is God, while the second one does not mean that. Just as it is not because someone lives in a house, that therefore the house is said to be a man, or to have formally the attributes of a man; therefore, Paul only wanted to say that the divinity dwells bodily in the humanity of Christ, that is, not apparently, as in the angels and prophets who represented the person of God, but really, so that that man really was God, and that humanity was the humanity of God.

The seventh argument is taken from Eph. 4:10: *He ascended far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things.* Oecumenius explains it in this way, because previously he had filled all things with his divinity, he descended and ascended, that he might fill all things with his flesh. Here he seems to want to say that Christ filled all things with his bodily presence in the same was as before he had filled all things with the majesty of the divinity. Likewise Theophylact in the same place says that the descent and ascent were not a problem for Christ, because in fact at the same time he could be everywhere.

I respond first of all that the phrase "that he might fill all things" can be understood

about the fulfillment of the prophecies. For, both the descent and the ascent had been foretold by the prophets, and although the adversaries laugh at this explanation, still until now they have not refuted it. Secondly, I say it can be understood about the fulfillment of places, but through their effects; for, Christ wanted to fill everything with his gloiy, and in all things to work wonders. Thirdly, it can be understood to be about the successive filling of places, while understanding by places, various kinds of places, as someone is said to have been in all of Europe, because he was in all the provinces of Europe, although he was not in every city or home in Europe. For thus Christ was on earth, he walked on water, he was in the air, on the cross; he was under the earth and in the underworld; therefore he should ascend into heaven that he might illuminate and fill all places with his presence.

Indeed this same text clearly teaches that Christ did not fill everything with the presence of his flesh. For to descend, and after that to ascend is opposed to filling; he should have diffused himself rather than descend and ascend, if he wanted to fill all things at the same time. Actually, it was not necessary for him to descend or to ascend, or even to diffuse himself, if he was always everywhere.

Oecumenius and Theophylact do not say anything against this. For, Oecumenius only says that *the flesh of Christ filled all things.* Which is to be understood in the way in which he could do it, that is, not at the same time, but successively by going to all places. And Theophylact did not say that the descent of Christ prevented him from at the same time ascending, but that it did not prevent him from ascending, which he did afterwards. For Theophylact is praising humility, and he shows that the more someone humbles himself here, the more he will be exalted, as happened in Christ. Therefore these two authors are incorrectly cited by the composers of the Concordia.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM THE INCARNATION IS ANSWERED

The eighth argument. By the Incarnation is was brought about that God and man would be one person; but a person is an individual substance. Therefore, one part of a person cannot be separated in any way from another part; so wherever one part is, there is also the other part. This is confirmed first of all from session 5 of the Council of Chalcedon, from session 17 of the Sixth Council, and from Leo in letter 83 to the Monks of Palestine, where we learn that the Incarnation was made out of two undivided natures, without separation and without confusion; therefore where one is, there is also the other; otherwise how are they undivided and united inseparably, if one is in heaven, and the other is on earth? And this is confirmed by Damascene in book 3, chapter 3; he not only says that the natures in Christ are united without separation, but also ἀδιαρέτως, that is, without distinction. Therefore, one is never separated from the other; but how are they not separated, if one is not where the other one is? Finally, it is confirmed by this—if the flesh of Christ is not eveiywhere with the Word, it follows that the Word somewhere is a man, and elsewhere he is not a man, which of course is absurd.

I respond: when an individual substance is given in the definition of a person, this lack of division is not to be understood, so that where there is one part of the person, there is also another part It is clear that that is false, for our hands and feet and the other members occupy different places, and still they make one person. Therefore, a person is said to be an individual substance, because it is one subsisting being without division in itself in the realm of subsistence, and divided from all others; and such is Christ who is God and man.

To the first and second confirmations I say than an inseparable and indistinct union is not required, so that the one is everywhere the other is, but only that they be somewhere at the same time; for, if they were nowhere at the same time, then they would truly be distinct among themselves. For example, the globe of the sun exists. It is united without separation and without distinction to its orbit, and still the orbit of the sun extends around the whole lower orbit, and it is at the same time in the west and in the east, which is not suitable for the globe of the sun.

They object: the sun is not united to its orbit according to the whole, but only according to a part. But the humanity is united to the whole Word. I respond: the humanity is indeed united to the whole Word, because the Word is indivisible; nevertheless, because of that, it is not equal to his immensity. Therefore, just as a star, because it is less in the size of its quantity than the size of its orbit, cannot at the same time be wherever the orbit is, so also the humanity of Christ, because it is less than the Word in the amount of its power, it cannot be wherever the Word is, even though it is not separated from it and distinct from it.

To the last confirmation I say that the proposition, 77?e *Word somewhere is not a man,* is false, if it means that the Word eveiywhere is subject to the humanity. For although the Word may be somewhere where the humanity is ηοζ nevertheless even there the Word is a man, because the Word existing there sustains the humanity as its own, although it is existing elsewhere. It is like the rational soul existing in the foot which is united with the head, and informs the head, although the head is not there where the feet are.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS IS ANSWERED

The ninth argument is from the Fathers. And first of all they cite Chrysostom in homily 17 on the letter to the Hebrews, and there he says this about Christ: *What do you mean,* he said, *unless he enters into heaven he will not appear before God who is everywhere andfills all things?* I respond that the solution is in the following words. Will you see him, he said, because all these things pertain to the flesh? With these words Chrysostom teaches that Christ, who as God is everywhere, still according to the flesh had to enter into heaven, that he might appear before the face of God on our behalf, because according to the flesh he was not in heaven before he ascended there.

Secondly, they quote Cyril in letter 1 to Successus: *The existing real body of God, asl said, transcends all human things.* Likewise, in book 12, chapter 32 in his commentaiy on John, while explaining the clothing of Christ tom into four parts, and his tunic remaining intact, says that this means that the flesh of Christ is communicated indivisibly to all men, who are in the four comers of the world: *The only-begotten going divisibly into each one,* he said, *and sanctifying their soul and body by his own flesh, he is indivisibly and integrally in all, since he is one everywhere being in no way divided.* Theophylact in his commentary on John 19 says the same thing in almost the same words.

I respond: in the first testimony Cyril says that the Lord's body transcends in dignity everything human, but from that it does not follow that he is everywhere. But since Brentius had these words of Cyril printed in capital letters, as if an unanswerable argument were contained in those few words, it is necessary to give an accurate response.

Therefore from both quotes it is gathered how Cyril understands that the body of Christ transcends all human things. First of all, concerning the first quote, Cyril derives his sentence from the words of Paul in 2 Cor. 5:16: *Even though we once regarded Christ from a human point of view, we regard him thus no longer.* There Paul wants to say that Christ now does not have a passible body, and that he is not subject to hunger, thirst, injury and death, as he says in 1 Cor. 15:50: *Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God.* And in Heb. 5:7: *In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, etc.* For elsewhere the same Paul in 1 Tim. 2:5 says that Christ even now is a man, and in 1 Cor. 15:12ff. at great length he shows that the body of Christ truly rose from the dead. Therefore this is also what Cyril means, namely, that the body of Christ now transcends all human things, that is, all human passions. Secondly, it is clear from what follows. For, while explaining the meaning of "all human things," he says that Chris t's body is incorruptible, vivified, and clothed with ineffable glory, but he does not add that it is immense and existing everywhere.

But concerning the second quote, Cyril and Theophylact are arguing in that place about the Eucharist, as is clear from what follows, where they refer to the type of the Paschal Lamb. Therefore, they did not want to say that the body of Christ is absolutely everywhere, but everywhere where there are those who communicate. For it could happen that at the same time communion is distributed in all parts of the world. But the

difference between this kind of Ubiquity, and that which the heretics teach, we showed above in our second argument, namely, that Christ is everywhere wherever there are consecrated Hosts, but that he is not absolutely everywhere, nor in infinite places at the same time, nor does he claim immensity. We showed that to be everywhere wherever the Word is, is to be absolutely everywhere, and to be, or to be able to be infinite places at the same time, also surely requires divine immensity.

Thirdly, they cite Ambrose in book 7, chapter 47 in his commentary on Luke regarding the words: *Whatever more you spend, I will repay, etc.* (Luke 10:35). *When,* he said, *will you return, Lord, unless it is on the day of judgment? For although you are always everywhere, and standing in the midst of us, you are not perceived by us, but there will be a time when all flesh will see you returning.* Those are his words. There he seems to say that Christ according to that form is everywhere invisibly, according to which he will be seen by all on the day of judgment, but that is a human form. I respond that the same Christ will return in his human form, and he is everywhere in the form of God, and the same will be seen, and not seen, by reason of the two natures or forms.

Fourthly, they cite Jerome in his book against Vigilantius, where he says that the Lamb of God, that is, Christ is eveiywhere. Likewise in letter 148 to Marcella, where to the question raised by Marcella about Christ—whether after the resurrection during those 40 days he was somewhere, that is, on earth, or did he secretly at times ascend into heaven and descend from heaven—he replies that it was not necessary for the Son of God often to ascend and to descend, since he is always everywhere. With this response Jerome either taught that the body of Christ is always everywhere, or certainly he was an outstanding deceiver. For, he had been asked about the body, not about the Divinity.

I respond to the first place that the solution is given there, and therefore that the impudence of Brentius is amazing, who proposed quotes of this kind only with the purpose of deceiving the unwary. For these are the words of St. Jerome: *If the Lamb,* he said, *is everywhere, then also those who are with the Lamb must be believed to be everywhere.* These are his words. But it is certain that the Saints are not everywhere at the same time, but successively, that is, they can move to whatever place they desire; why, therefore, do we not understand in the same way that the Lamb is everywhere, that is, that he can instantly be present wherever he wishes?

To the second place I say that Jerome, when he says that the Son of God is everywhere, is speaking about the Divinity alone; his own words bear witness to this: *It is stupid,* he said, *that his power should be limited by the smallness of one little body, whom the heavens cannot contain; and nevertheless he who was everywhere also in the Son of man was total. For the divine nature, and the Word of God cannot be cut into pieces, nor divided up in various places; but, since he is everywhere, he is totally everywhere.* There you see that Jerome asserts that the divine power is not limited by the smallness of the one little body of Christ, and therefore that the Divinity is broader than the flesh of Christ. Similarly you see that Jerome says that the nature and Word of God, that is, the Son as God is everywhere, and at the same time he is totally in the man Christ, for the Godhead is indivisible, even though it fills everything.

But, they say, Marcella did not ask about the Divinity, but about the humanity, and

she could not be ignorant about the fact that the Divinity is everywhere. I respond that Marcella proposed a question about the Lord; and because the Lord has two natures, Jerome rightly responds that the Lord according to one nature always was everywhere. And it is possible that Marcella, or the one in whose name she proposed the question, knew that the Word of God was not outside his own humanity. For, we see also that a similar question was proposed to Augustine by Volusianus: that is, whether the Word of God abandoned heaven, and betook himself to the confines of one little body. On this see letter 3 of Augustine. Certainly Jerome in his whole response tries to demolish this idea, lest it be believed that God was reduced to the limitations of one little body.

Fifthly, they cite Augustine in Sermon 14 on the words of the Apostles. *He sits in heaven,* he said, *who walks on the earth; he was in heaven, because Christ is everywhere, and the same Christ is both the Son of God and the Son of man.* You see it is not said that the humanity is in heaven and the Divinity on earth, but the Son of man is in heaven, that is, the person, and on earth is the Son of God, that is, the same person, because that person is everywhere.

Sixthly, they cite Gelasius in his book on the two natures. *This,* he said, *must be avoided in speech and in hearing: either that the man now ceases to be God, if the humanity alone is there and the Divinity does not also remain; or that God consequently ceases to be a man, if the Divinity alone is there and the humanity does not also remain united to it.* I respond that the "there" does not signify a place, but Christ or the mystery of the Incarnation; for he wants to say, *If in Christ there is only the Divinity, or only the humanity, then Christ will not be God and man.* And this is evident from the following words: *It will seem,* he said, *that the mind is afraid to say, but necessity forces me not to remain silent, that the Divinity in both cases is changeable, either if it is changed into flesh, or if the transferred condition of the humanity is in the Divinity in such a way that it ceases to be its property.*

CHAPTER XIX

THE ARGUMENT BASED ON THE TEACHING OF THE SCHOLASTICS IS ANSWERED

The tenth argument is taken from the Scholastics. Brentius contends that his defense of Ubiquity is the teaching not only of the ancient Fathers, but also of the principal Scholastics. And first of all he cites the Master in book 3, dist. 22, where he says: *The whole Christ is, wherever he is, but not entirely.* But what this is—to be whole everywhere but not entirely, Brentius says is explained by Thomas in III, q. 52, a. 3, where Thomas teaches that Christ is whole everywhere, but not entirely, because he is not circumscribed by any place.

He also cites Bonaventure on Sent. 3, dist. 22, q. 2, and he has this to say: *When it is said,* "This man is everywhere," *the pronoun "this" can demonstrate the person of Christ, or an individual man. If it refers to the person of Christ, so without doubt this is true,* "This man is everywhere"; *but if he is an individual man, it is still true, but not by his own nature, but by the communication of idioms, because what belongs to the Son of God by nature, belongs to This man through grace.*

Finally, he cites the Compendium of theological truth, book 1, chapter 17, where this is stated: *Although the body of Christ is not everywhere, since it is a creature, nor can it be equal to the Creator in this matter; nevertheless it is in many places totally in different hosts, and this is because of the union of the flesh with the Word.* But that reason proves, Brentius said, that it is simply everywhere, for nowhere is there not a personal union of the flesh with the Word. Therefore either the Compendium is contradicting itself, or when it says "the body of Christ is not everywhere," it means that it is not everywhere per se, but by the grace of God. I respond that all the Scholastics expressly teach the opposite, so that even on this point the shamelessness of Brentius may be shown in no small manner. And first of all, when the Master says, *The whole Christ is everywhere, but not entirely,"* in the same place he explains what he means with these words: *the word "entirely" refers to the nature, "whole" to the hypostasis, etc.* Therefore, the whole Christ is everywhere, because the whole divine person is everywhere, but the entirety of Christ is not everywhere, because his other nature is not everywhere.

In addition, when St. Thomas in the cited place says that the whole Christ is everywhere, but not entirely, because he is not circumscribed by place, he is not explaining the Master, nor is he speaking about the body of Christ, but about the divine person. Hence in the body of the article he says that during the three days of death the soul of Christ was in the underworld, the body in the sepulcher, the Divinity everywhere. And in Contra Gentiles, book 4, chapter 49, he said: *The Word of God, of course, has no subsistence from the human nature; rather, he draws the human nature to his subsistence or personality. It is not through, but in, human nature that he subsists. Hence, nothing prevents the Word of God from being everywhere, although the human nature assumed by the Word of God is not everywhere.* And in his Commentary on 3 Sent., dist. 22, q. 1, a. 1 he said: *I respond by saying that the human nature of Christ is not everywhere.*

Also Bonaventure on 3 Sent., dist. 22, q. 2 speaks so clearly that he could not be more

clear. For, to the proposed question, whether Christ is everywhere as a man, he replies with these words: *This question can be about the reality, or about a way of speaking;* if it is about the reality, *then the clear response must be,* that the humanity of Christ was not, and is not wherever his divinity is, *because the divine nature is immense and infinite, and therefore it determines no place for itself; but since human nature is created, it determines a place for itself Similarly, by reason of the humanity, inasmuch as it is of itself it is in only one place; but that it is in several places, this it is under the Sacrament.* Those are his words.

Therefore, since he adds later that the Son of man is everywhere through the communication of idioms, because what belongs to the Son of man through grace, that belongs to the Son of God by nature, he is not speaking about the reality, but about a way of speaking. For, because through the grace of union (he is speaking about this grace, not about some created grace) it came about that the one person is both God and man, therefore it is rightly said that the Son of man is everywhere, because actually that person, who is the Son of man, is everywhere.

Finally, that Compendium of Theology, when it says that the body of Christ is in many places sacramentally because of its union with the Word, does not want to say that the formal and immediate reason why the body of Christ is in many places is its union with the Word, for then it would too openly contradict itself, and it would have to concede that also outside the Sacrament the body of Christ is in many places, and in fact that it was such from the conception; but it wanted to indicate that, because of its union with the Word, the man Christ could put his body in many places. For, because that man is God, therefore he can do this; but we, who are only men, can indeed be put in many places by God, if he should wish it, but we cannot put ourselves in many places.

And then, whatever the case may be with the Compendium, it is certain that all the Scholastic Doctors—Albert, Durandus, Scotus, Gabriel, and others, in their commentaries on 3 Sent., dist. 22, in clear words and in common agreement teach the same thing; for, all say that there is no question about the matter itself, since it is certain that the body of Christ is not everywhere; but on how to speak about this they establish three rules.

The first is, when it is asked whether Christ the man is everywhere: if man is the subject of the proposition, it must be conceded absolutely that he is everywhere, because then the word "man" stands for the suppositum. Therefore this is simply true—Christ the man is eveiywhere.

The second is, if "man" is the predicate and the adverb "everywhere" modifies the subject, similarly the proposition must be conceded. Therefore, when I say "Christ everywhere is a man," I am speaking the truth, if that "everywhere" modifies the subject; for, the meaning is that Christ, who is everywhere, is a man.

The third is, if "man" is the predicate, and "eveiywhere" modifies the predicate, then the proposition is false. For I say "Christ eveiywhere is a man," if eveiywhere it means the joining of the subject with the predicate, this means that Christ in eveiy place has his humanity present with himself, and that is false.

CHAPTER XX

THE LAST OBJECTION BASED ON NATURAL REASON IS ANSWERED

Here is the last argument of Brentius. Christ the man doubtless is very happy, very beautiful, very blessed; therefore he is present everywhere. For, to be circumscribed by place, and to walk from one place to another is not a mark of divine excellence, but of corporeal weakness, not of heavenly majesty but of earthly smallness, not of spiritual beauty but of bodily deformity.

I respond that he is blessed (as St. Augustine teaches in book 3, chapter 3 on the Trinity). *He has everything he desires, and he desires nothing improperly',* but beauty is the proportion of the members, with a balance of color, as the same Augustine says in book 22, chapter 19 in *The City of God.* From this it follows that for God, who is by nature immense, it is necessary for his happiness and beauty that he be everywhere. For if he were not that, he would not have everything he desires, or he would desire something improperly. But for a true man, who has a finite and bodily nature, and has the instruments of motion, it would be evil and ugly, if he could not be moved, and if he were perfectly intact so that he could experience the mature form and figure of his members. Therefore the argument of Brentius is so admirable that clearly it produces a result contrary to what he intended.

But in this place I cannot fail to mention these words of Brentius: *to be circumscribed by place, and to walk from one place to another is not a mark of divine excellence, but of corporeal weakness, not of heavenly majesty but of earthly smallness, not of spiritual beauty but of bodily deformity.* For what else do these words proclaim but the purest Eutychianism? For, if you remove from the humanity of Christ the corporeal, the earthly and the flesh, as Brentius does, and if you attribute to it divine excellence, heavenly majesty, and spiritual beauty, as Brentius does, are you not manifestly changing the humanity into the Divinity, and completely dissolving the mystery of the Incarnation? Indeed from the beginning Satan had this end in view, when he stirred up Luther, and gradually through the rejection of Indulgences, Purgatory, and similar things, finally the matter reached the point that Christ himself and the greatest mysteries of our Faith were impiously denied. But we have said enough about these matters. Now we must move on to the last disputes about Christ.

BOOK FOUR

On the soul of Christ and his descent into the underworld

CHAPTER 1

THE FIRST CONTROVERSY ON THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE SOUL OF CHRIST IS PROPOSED

So far we have considered the Divinity of Christ and the Incarnation; now concerning his soul, we will explain not everything that is usually considered by theologians, but only those things that have been put into doubt by our contemporary heretics. Therefore, there are two controversies at this time about the soul of Christ: one is about its perfection, the other is about the descent into the underworld. We will speak now about the first point. There was an ancient heresy of the Agnostics; the author was Themistius Diaconus, according to St. Liberatus in chapter 19 of the Breviarium and St. Gregory in book 8 of letter 42. They taught that Christ did not know the day of judgment and they attributed this ignorance not to the divinity of Christ but to his humanity, as is clear from their argument. For they argued in this way—that the Word received a corruptible body, so that by dying for us he might free us from death. Therefore he also received our ignorance, that is, an ignorant human mind, so that he might free us from ignorance.

Almost all the contemporary heretics follow this heresy; they say that the soul of Christ gradually learned what it truly did not know, and also lost something that had to be corrected; and even though they did not dare to say that this was a sin on his part, nevertheless it really was a sin, if it had to be corrected.

Martin Luther in his work on the Nativity of the Lord, while treating the place in Mark 13:32 concerning that day, said the following: *Here they cite an inopportune narration, saying that the Son did not know, that is, he did not want to know. What need is there for those comments? Christ was a true man, wherefore like another pure and holy man, he did not at all times think, say, will or understand all things.* And after that: *For just as at all times he did not see, hear or sense all things, so also in his heart he did not always know everything, but only what he needed and what the Lord taught him.* Luther expresses similar views in his homily on the first Sunday after Epiphany, while explaining the words, *He increased in wisdom and in grace* (Luke 2:52).

Zwingli also in his Confession for Charles V, in article 1, says that the wisdom of Christ grew gradually.

Bucerus in his comments on Matt. 24:36 said: *Therefore, just as he received in himself all the limitations of human infirmity, having been made like men in all things, sin alone excepted, so also he assumed human knowledge and ignorance, namely a human mind and reason, which at times changes, either by increasing or decreasing. Indeed it is according to this that he is said to be ignorant of something. Therefore elsewhere it is*

written: He increased in wisdom and in grace.

Calvin in his comments on Matt. 24 said: *Furthermore, he would be utterly insane who would subject himself unwillingly to ignorance, to which the Son of God himself did not refiise to subject himself to on our behalf* He says something similar regarding Luke 2:52 and he uses the same argument that the Agnostics used. Theodore Beza in his book against Andreas Jacobi on the two natures of Christ, when he was charged with attributing ignorance to the soul of Christ, did not deny it, but responded that he was following Luther and Calvin.

Again, Calvin in comments on Matt. 26 says that *the prayer of Christ in the garden was a broken desire.* And below that: *Having been struck with fear,* he said, *he was filled with anxiety, so that it would be necessary, among the violent disturbances of the temptations, as it were, to waver between conflicting desires. This is the reason why, having prayed for death, he got control of himself immediately, and subjecting himself to the will of his Father; suddenly he rejects and revokes that previous desire.* Note that word "suddenly," likewise the words "he rejects and revokes." And after that: *We see,* he said, *how Christ immediately after his imprisonment controls his emotions, and he conducts himself in a mature and orderly manner.* And in the same place: *This prayer of Christ,* he said, *was not considered, but the power and force of sorrow extorted a sudden cry from him, to which a correction was immediately added; the same vehemence especially of the heavenly decree took away his memory.* Those are his words, which do not hesitate to attribute to Christ not only ignorance, but also foigetfulness and sin.

Five texts of Scripture make up the foundation of his opinion. The first is Heb. 2:17 and 4:15: *He had to be made like his brethren in every respect.* The second is Luke 2:40: *And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the favor of God was upon him.* For in Greek the word is not "full" but "he was filled"; for the word is not πλήρης, but the present participle πληρούμενον. The third is in the same place: *And Jesus increased in wisdom, stature and grace.* The fourth is Mark 13:32: *But of that day no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.* The fifth is Matt. 26:39: *If it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as you will.* For the Lord seems to revoke and correct his previous prayer. And furthermore, the Lord either knew it was possible that the chalice could be passed, or he knew that it was impossible, or he did not know whether it was possible or impossible. If he did not know, he was ignorant; if he knew it were possible, why did he doubt? If he knew it was impossible, why did he ask? Finally, did he not come to die for the human race? Why, therefore, did he pray about his death?

But the common understanding of Catholics always was that the soul of Christ, from the moment of its creation, was full of wisdom and knowledge, so that afterwards he learned nothing that he did not already know, and he did not and could not perform any action, which needed to be corrected. All Theologians teach this with the Master in reference to 3 Sent., dist. 13, and also all the Fathers, as we shall soon see.

CHAPTER II

THIS TRUTH IS PROVED FROM THE SCRIPTURES

Therefore, now we have to prove with a few quotes that the soul of Christ from its creation was filled with wisdom and grace. We will attempt to prove this from the testimonies of the Scriptures, from the teaching of the Father, and with arguments taken from reason itself. First of all, we have the testimony of Isa. 11:1-2: *There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom, etc.* All authors understand this text to be about Christ. And all those texts signify the same thing, where Christ is said to be anointed from God by the Holy Spirit, as in Ps. 45:7: *Therefore God, your God, has anointed you, etc.* And Isa. 61:1: *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me.* And Acts 4:26: *The rulers were gathered together, against the Lord and against his Anointed.* And Acts 10:38: *God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power.*

But there are two difficulties with these texts. First, because it is not said in any of these texts that the anointing was done in the conception itself; indeed it seems to have been done at the age of 30, when the Holy Spirit descended upon him in the form of a dove, as St. Jerome seems to say in his Commentary on Isa. 61.

The second difficulty is, because although it might be established that Christ was anointed by the Holy Spirit in his conception, and was filled with all gifts, nevertheless afterwards he could still have an increase in wisdom and knowledge. For, in Luke 1:15 it is said of John: *He will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb;* and still all admit that afterwards he increased with many gifts.

I respond to the first difficulty that this anointing could not have taken place except in the conception itself. First, because the words of Isaiah signify this: *There shall come forth a shoot from the stump of Jesse, and a branch shall grow out of his roots. And the Spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom, etc.* For, Isaiah joins together with the Incarnation, or the conception of Christ from the Virgin (for what else is a blooming shoot but a Virgin conceiving? indeed also the fruit of a tree designates a birth, a flower conceived) the descent of the Holy Spirit on Christ with the total abundance of his gifts. Therefore, on the flower itself, that is, on Christ the man not yet born, but conceived, the Holy Spirit descended, and filled him with wisdom, understanding, counsel, fortitude, knowledge and piety.

Secondly, because if the Lord Jesus was not anointed until he reached the age of 30, the angel would not have said to the shepherds in Luke 2:11: *To you is born this day in the city of David a Savior, who is Christ the Lord.* What is the Christ, but the anointed one? Right then he was anointed, and he could justly be called the Christ, when he was born of the Virgin.

Thirdly, because in John 1:14 we read: *And the Word became flesh and dwelt among us, full of grace and truth; we have beheld his glory, glory as of the only Son from the Father.* There the expression "full of grace and truth," since it is in the nominative

masculine case in the Greek text, πλήρης, it should be joined together with the word "Word" in Greek, λόγος, so that the meaning is "the Word became flesh and was full of grace and truth"; therefore also here the fullness of grace is joined to the Incarnation.

Fourthly, if the anointing took place at some time other than the conception, we say that it had to be in his thirtieth year, when the Holy Spirit descended upon him; but it did not happen then, for as Augustine says in book 15, chapter 26 on the Trinity it is absurd to say that Christ at age 30 received the Holy Spirit, when his Precursor received him while being in his mother's womb. And furthermore, in Luke 2:40 Christ, while still an infant, is said to be full, or that he was filled with wisdom, and that the grace of God was in him. Therefore he did not wait 30 years for the spirit of wisdom and grace.

There is no problem in the fact that Jerome in his commentary on Isa. 61 says that the anointing of Christ took place in his thirtieth year. For, Jerome wanted to say that Chriſζ who had been anointed in his conception invisibly, was anointed in his baptism visibly, that is, that his anointing was then made known by an exterior sign, which before he had already receive interiorly.

Here is my response to the second difficulty: although John, and other men were so filled at the beginning that they could still increase later, nevertheless Christ could not increase, because at the beginning he received grace without measure, while the others receive it in a measured way. For, John says about Christ in 1:16: *From his fullness we have all received;* for, God does not give the spirit according to measure, that is, to his Son; about others Eph. 4:7 says: *Grace was given to each of us according to the measure of Christ's gift.* Hence it is said in John 21:17: *Lord, you know everything.* And in Col. 2:3: *In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.*

CHAPTER III

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE TEACHING OF THE FATHERS

Now the testimonies of the Fathers will be added. Eusebius, in book 10, last chapter of his Demonstration of the Gospel, when explaining Ps. 22:10, from these words, *since my mother bore me you have been my God,* deduces that the soul of Christ in the womb of the Virgin had perfect knowledge and unchangeableness, indeed also that he saw God, and to this knowledge nothing can be added. *When,* he said, *I was still hidden in the womb that bore me, nevertheless I saw you, my God.* And before that he said: *I was thought, like other human infants, to be imperfect, and without the use of reason; but I was not like that, although my body was like that of other human beings.*

Ambrose in book 5, chapter 18 in his book on Faith proposes the opinion of some who say that Christ as God knew everything, but not as man, because it is written: *He increased in wisdom, etc.* Then he refutes this, saying: *But still more am I inclined to think that the Son Who went about with men, and lived the life of man, and took upon Him our flesh, assumed also our feelings; so that after our ignorance He might say He knew not, though there was not anything He did not know.* Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration on Basil, near the middle, said: *He increased in wisdom, not that they should take this as an increase in him (for what could be more perfect than that which from the beginning was perfect?), but that it was gradually made known and allowed to shine.*

Jerome in his comments on Isa. 11 says that on Christ, conceived in Mary, the Holy Spirit descended, not partially as on the other saints: *But according to the Gospel which the Nazarenes read,* he said, *the whole fount of the Holy Spirit will descend on him.* And on Jer. 31:22 concerning the words: *a woman surrounds a man. Without the seed of a man, without any coitus,* he said, *a woman surrounds a man in the middle of her womb, according to the increase of age through infancy and childhood he is seen to increase is wisdom and age; but the perfect man in the womb of the virgin was therefrom the beginning.*

Athanasius in Sermon 4 against the Arians simply denies that Christ increased in wisdom: *Is that man,* he said, *like other men, or is he God endowed with humanity and flesh? But if he is just a common man, let him be, so that he may grow in perfection like other men. But that is the opinion of the Samosatenians, which you favor with all your strength, etc.* It is surely true that Athanasius is speaking especially about Christ with regard to his Divinity, when he denied that he increased in wisdom; however, since he admits progress only regarding the external manifestation of wisdom, and simply denies that Christ in any way increased with internal progress, it is quite apparent that he means that he is also speaking about Christ as a man.

Augustine in book 2, chapter 29 of his work on Merit and the Forgiveness of Sins: *Now that such entire ignorance existed, I cannot suppose in the infant in whom the Word was made flesh, that He might dwell among us; nor can I imagine that such weakness of the mental faculty ever existed in the infant Christ which we see in infants generally.* And after that: *Inasmuch, however, as in Him there was the likeness of sinful flesh, He willed*

lo pass through the changes of the various stages of life, beginning even with infancy. There Augustine concedes only that Christ grew in age, and underwent changes, but not in gifts of the mind. And in book 15, chapter 26 on the Trinity he judges it to be absurd that Christ received the Holy Spirit at any time other than at his conception.

Cyril in book 20, chapter 7 of his Theses clearly says that nothing was added to Christ, even though we read that he grew in wisdom and grace. And in book 1 of his comments on John 17 he said: *Since daily men showed more admiration for him, what* gw ra *their opinion of Jesus rather than the perfection of his grace.* Gregory in book 8 of letter 42 praises Eulogius who had written against the Agnoetes, and he also briefly refutes that heresy. Sophronius also in the letter to Sergius, which was read during the Hth session of the Sixth Council, condemns Themistius, the founder of the Agnoetes.

Bede in his homily on the first Sunday after Epiphany said: *According to the nature of man he increased in wisdom, not indeed that he became wiser with time, who from the first moment of his conception remained full of wisdom, but that same wisdom, of which he was full, he made known to others with the passage of time, etc.* Damascene in book 3, chapter 22 said: *Those who say that he grew in wisdom and grace, and therefore received and addition of them, do not adore the union according to the hypostasis, etc.*

Bernard, in homily 2 on the *Missus est,* said: *Whether hidden in the womb, or lying in the manger, or now as a youth in the Temple, or now as a mature adult teaching the people, he was always full of the Holy Spirit. And there was not an hour at whatever age he had, during which the fullness of grace, which he received in his conception in the womb, was in any way either diminished or added to.* See also Anselm in book 1 of *Cur Deus Homo?,* and Theophylact on Luke 2.

CHAPTER IV

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM REASON

Finally, we add some arguments taken from reason. First. It is in no way credible that the Word became personally a man, and did not at the same time in the Incarnation pour into that humanity every good thing of which it was capable. For, if he made that soul his own soul, so that it truly is called and is the soul of God, how probable is it that he did not fill it immediately with wisdom? For, it is absurd that the soul of Wisdom itself should be at some time unwise. And this is what Damascene claims, when he says that they do not believe in the Incarnation, who believe that that soul gradually increased in knowledge.

The second reason. Wisdom and grace were nature for the man Christ, as Augustine teaches in chapter 40 of the Enchiridion, not indeed that it was not infused by God into the soul, but because in Christ it flowed from an intrinsic principle and by means of nature; the reason is that Christ filled himself with grace and wisdom, that is, these gifts flowed from one nature of Christ into the other. Therefore, Christ did not receive that wisdom or grace after the Incarnation, but in the Incarnation itself; therefore it is said to be natural, because it was present immediately and abundantly.

The third reason. Christ the man in the Incarnation began to be the Son of God; therefore then he had to be filled with all gifts, because the Son is the heir of all the paternal gifts. And Christ did not have to wait for succession to take place from the death of the Father, as is well known. And this seems to be the reason of Cyril in book 1 on John 17, where he says that God gave Christ all wisdom and grace, because he was the Son; but that he gave only some gifts to the others, because they are servants, as also Abraham is said to have done in Gen. 25:5-6, who gave everything he had to his son Isaac while he was still living; but to the children of his concubines he gave some gifts.

The fourth reason. Christ the man in the Incarnation became the Head, not only of men, but also of angels, as all admit. Therefore, then he had to be filled with wisdom, grace, and also beatitude itself; for it would not be fitting that the Head would be less adorned, and less wise than his members.

The fifth reason. Adam was created as a very wise man, as is gathered from the fact that soon after the creation he gave names to all the animals in Gen. 2:20; therefore the second Adam, in his conception, for a much greater reason had to be full of wisdom.

CHAPTER V

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE ANSWERED

To the reasoning of the Agnoetes and Calvinists, which St. Gregory proposes but does not answer, saying that he would solve them at another time, I respond that Christ received two things from our nature in the Incarnation. First, an integral nature with everything that pertains to its perfection; for, as Athanasius says in the Creed: *Christ is perfect God and perfect man.* Secondly, he received some defects consequent upon our corrupt nature, like death, hunger, thirst, etc., but not all of our defects. For, he did not receive sin, an inclination towards evil, and ignorance; the reason is that these defects do not pertain to the essence or perfection of the assumed nature. He did not have to receive of this kind, except those that contribute to the purpose of the Incarnation, which was to save men. Indeed by suffering and dying he could merit before God, because patience is a virtue; but an inclination to sin, sin itself and ignorance were not useful for the salvation of men, but rather opposed to it. For sin cannot be taken away by sin, as death was killed by death.

Therefore, since Scripture teaches that *Christ had to be made like his brethren in every respect, sin alone excepted* (Heb. 2:17; 4:15), it is not necessary to conclude from that that he also had to be like us in ignorance, which is not a sin, and nevertheless is in us. For, when sin is excepted, by the words "sin alone excepted," it is not only sins that are understood to be excepted, but also all those defects, which were not useful for redemption. And when it is said "to be made like them in eveiy respect," by the phrase "in every respect" all those things are understood, which pertain to the perfection of nature, or lead to redemption. Otherwise, if everything had to be in Christ that is in us, he would not have to be conceived by the Holy Spirit, nor to be bom of the Virgin, nor in his infancy to be filled with wisdom, nor to lack the rebellion of his lower passions; in fact, he would have had to be afflicted with fever, gout, and other illnesses.

Add this that the statement is not found anywhere, as it is cited by them. For, in Heb. 2:17 we read this: *He had to be made like his brethren in every respect;* but in this place it is not said "sin alone excepted"; and the meaning is: *He had to be made like us in everything that pertains to nature.* In Heb. 4:15 we read: *In every respect he has been tempted as we are, yet without sinning.* And the meaning is: *Christ was tempted in every respect,* that is, *he experienced all the evils,* which men are accustomed to suffer in body, in soul, in honor, in faculties, in friends and relatives; and still none of these temptations ever led him to sin.

Indeed concerning the other testimony of Scripture, whose whole force is placed on the Greek word πληρούμενος, I respond first of all that the word πληρούμενος sometimes signifies *overflowing with,* which is the same as πλήρης, and our translator adopts this meaning, and renders it as "full."

Secondly, I say: if we read in the passive voice "he was filled," then the meaning will be that daily more and more his bodily organs were filled with both created and uncreated wisdom, and they were moved and adapted to accomplish more excellent works. Athanasius suggests this meaning in Sermon 4 against the Arians, and this

meaning is very much in accord with the text. For, the boy grew in his body, and he was strengthened in spirit, not coming to him from outside, but it was already in him, so that he might perform more perfect works; likewise, he was filled with wisdom, not infused from elsewhere, but it was in himself diffusing itself, and controlling all his members and all his senses. Hence it follows: *And the grace of God was upon him;* he does not say: *He acquired grace,* but, *grace was upon him,* strengthening and directing him. Therefore, just as in the conception the Spirit and wisdom filled that little body as its own little temple, so afterwards, as that temple grew, the spirit in a certain way extended itself and filled the whole.

Thirdly, the same thing can also be said, that he was filled with wisdom acquired by his own proper experience; for although he was ignorant of nothing theoretically, since he had infused knowledge of all things, still practically he did not know all those things that he had not experienced. As Paul says, he learned obedience through what he suffered (Heb. 5:8). And this seems to be the explanation of St. Ambrose in chapter 7 of his book on Sacrament of the Incarnation of the Lord, where he says that Christ had a human nature perfect from the beginning, and still he grew in a human way.

The third testimony of Scripture is that found in Luke 2:52: *And Jesus increased in wisdom, age and grace.* But it is the certain and common explanation of the Fathers we cited above, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril, Damascene, Theophylact, Bede, Anselm, Bernard and others that Christ increased in wisdom and grace in the opinion of men, to whom daily he revealed more of his wisdom. It is like the Sun, because the higher it ascends in the middle of the sky, the more it is said to increase in light and warmth, not because in itself it is brighter or warmer, but because its power becomes more apparent.

Damascene adds in the place cited that as the Bishop is said to increase in his Church by his sermons, when the people grow in virtue, and a teacher in school is said to increase, when he causes his students to become more learned, so also Christ is said to increase, because he made others increase.

But Calvin objects to this, because Luke says that Christ increased in favor with God and men; but he did not increase in the opinion of God, nor did he make God increase.

I respond that the words "with God and men" should be joined with increase in grace, not with increase in wisdom or age. For we are not accustomed to say that someone increased in wisdom or age with God and men; for, wisdom and age are absolute things, and they do not depend on someone else; but we rightly say that someone increases in grace with others, to whom daily he becomes more gracious.

Therefore Christ is said to have increased in grace with God and men, because daily he was loved more by men, and he received signs of God's benevolence, or, what comes to the same thing, he grew daily in external signs of the benevolence of God and men, as is said about Samuel in 1 Sam. 2:26: *Now the boy Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men.*

Moreover, he increased before men in wisdom, inasmuch as, as has been said, by multiplying his works of wisdom, he made others grow, and he also daily seemed to become wiser. Secondly, by the works full of wisdom and grace which he did, truly he increased in wisdom and grace with God and men, because he did noble and very

meritorious works, in the judgment both of God and of men.

Now concerning the fourth testimony of Scripture, the Fathers have different opinions. Ambrose in book 5, chapter 8 on Faith and Jerome on Matt. 24:36 suspect that the phrase "nor the Son" was added by the Arians, because it is not found in all the Greek codices; however, because in Mark 13:32 it is found in all the codices, it is necessary to respond in a different way.

The first explanation is that of Gregoiy in book 4, letter 42 to Eulogius, where he approves the opinion of Eulogius that Christ is said not to know that day, not as far as his own person is concerned, but in the person of the Church. For, many things said about Christ are understood to be about the body, not about the head. But against this it could be objected: because then the Lord should not have said, *Neither the angels, nor the Son,* for since the angels are included also in the body of Christ which is the Church, it was enough to say, *The Son does not know.* And perhaps on this account Gregory elsewhere adds two other explanations, because this first one did not seem to be completely satisfactory.

The second explanation of Gregory in the same place, and also that of Ambrose in comments on Luke 17, of Nazianzen in Oration 4 on Theology, and of Cyril in book 9, chapter 4 of his Theses is that Christ the man is said not to know the day, because he did not know it as man, that is, with human knowledge, but he did know it by divine revelation or infusion. But this also did not seem to be fully satisfactory, for the Apostles wanted to learn from Christ that day; but he responded that he did not know it, and because of that also that he could not teach it. But if he knew it by divine revelation, surely he could have taught it.

The third explanation is that of Epiphanius in Ancora, and Chrysostom in his homily on the Trinity, tome 3, and Bernard in his book on the 12 degrees of humility; their position is that Jesus is said not to know the day, because he did not know it practically, just as Adam was said not to know good and evil before he sinned. But the Father is said to know it, because he knows it practically, since he gave all judgment to the Son and he himself in a certain sense has already judged. But this also does not seem to be sufficient; for, the Apostles did not want to know it practically, but theoretically; and therefore it was not really to the point—whether the Lord knew the day practically, or he did not know it.

Therefore, there is the last explanation of the same St. Gregory, in the place cited, and also of Ambrose in book 3, chapter 8 on Faith, of Jerome, Chrysostom, Theophylact on Matt. 24:36, of Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, and Augustine in book 1 on Genesis, in chapter 22 against the Manicheans, and in book 1, chapter 12 on the Trinity: they say that the Son is said not to know the day, because he did not know it as something to be told to others, and because he made them not to know it. Surely this explanation is in accordance with the text. For, the Lord wanted to give them a reason why he did not make the day known to them, and he says that the reason is, because he does not know it, that is, he did not leam this from the Father as something to reveal to others, but as a secret to keep for himself.

Furthermore, Scripture passim speaks in this way, as in Gen. 22:12: *Now I know that you fear God,* that is, *now I have shown you and others how much you revere me.* And John 15:15: *I have called you friends, for all that I have heard from my Father I*

have made known to you. But he did not make simply everything known to them. For, in 16:12 he says: *I have yet many things to say to you, but you cannot bear them now.* Therefore he had told them whatever he had heard from the Father that should be said to them; therefore in this place he says that he does not know, except what he knows he is supposed to say to them.

But to this Calvin raises an objection: for since Christ says, *No one knows, neither the angels nor the Son,* if the expression "nor the Son" is so understood that the Son does indeed know, but not so that he can reveal it, therefore it can also be said of the angels that they do indeed know, but not so that they can reveal it. Moreover, a second objection could be made: for when we say that the Son does not know so that he can reveal it, it is to be understood either in the sense that he does not know it in a way he can reveal it, or he does not know it as something to be revealed to the Apostles. If it is the first way, it is false that the Son does not know it in a say to be revealed, for he revealed it to the Holy Spirit. If it is the second way, the exception is false—except the Father, for the Father did not know it as something to be said to the Apostles.

I respond to the first objection: from the words of the Lord it is gathered that neither the angels nor the Son know it as something to be spoken; but whether they know it in some other way is not explained. But we know from other sources that Christ does know, both because he has been established as the Judge, and also, *because in him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge* (Col. 2:3). But concerning the angels, we believe that they do not know the day in any way, both because this knowledge is not necessary for them, and also because we read nowhere that the angels know this.

To the second objection I say that the Son does not know it in a way to reveal it to anyone, but I understand this to be about the Son as he is a man, for as such he did not make the Holy Spirit know. But the Father alone is said to know, for he made Christ the man to know it, as Augustine says on Genesis 1 and in chapter 22 against the Manicheans; this is fitting for the Father, and it is also fitting for the other persons, who are of the same nature; therefore it is the same thing as if he had said, *No one knows except God.*

To the fifth Scripture quote I say that it is an impious blasphemy, that Christ prayed without the Spirit» or corrected or revoked his own prayer. For it is written about him: *He committed no sin,* 1 Pet. 2:22. And, *Who knew no sin,* 2 Cor. 5:21. And the Fathers passim teach that Christ not only did not sin, but that he could not sin. See Athanasius in his Oration 2 against the Arians, Cyril in book 2 on John 11, and Augustine in the Enchiridion, chapters 36 and 40, and others.

But Scripture says that he said, *Father, if it is possible:* therefore, either he knew whether it was possible, or he did not know. If he did not know, then he did not know something. If he knew it was possible, why did he speak in a doubtful way? If he knew it is impossible, why did he ask? Moreover, when he says, *Let this cup pass from me,* he seems to oppose right reason, and the will of the Father, for he had come for the purpose of suffering. Finally, when he adds, *Not my will, but thine be done,* he seems openly to emend what he had just asked for.

I respond: the expression "if it is possible" means, "if it is pleasing to you"; for he knew that for God nothing is impossible. But he asks whether it be possible according

to God's good pleasure, and this is clear from the other Evangelists. For, what he says in Matt. 26:39, *If it is possible,* he says in Mark 14:36, *All things are possible to you.* And in Luke 22:42: *Father, if you are willing, remove this cup from me.* But he says "if you are willing," not because he did not know that the Father did not will it, but in order to show the natural attraction of his own will to flee the death connected with complete subjection to the paternal will. It is the same thing as if he were to say: *I wish that what I wish will not take place,* that is, *I wish with a deliberate will, which considers the object with all its circumstances, that what I will with a natural will should not take place, and this refers to the object determined by you alone.* And these wills are not contrary, for they are not dealing with the same thing considered in the same way. And moreover, one is more velleity than will.

You will say: why did Christ in his prayer want to express that natural will, which he knew could not be fulfilled? I respond with Chrysostom on this text: he said it in order to show that he is a true man, and that he truly lamented, and suffered and died. For if, since he expressed his natural feelings so often, there are still many heretics who deny the true flesh and passion of Christ, what would happen if he had manifested no such sentiment?

Moreover, he wanted to express this in order to teach us not to be distressed, when we do not get from God what we ask for. For, in this prayer Christ was heard partly, and partly he was not heard. He was heard because he absolutely asked, according to John 11:42: *I know that you hear me always.* But he was not heard because he asked from a natural affection, according to the saying in Ps. 22:2: *I cry by day, but you do not answer.*

CHAPTER VI

THE SECOND QUESTION IS PROPOSED, WHICH IS ABOUT THE DESCENT INTO THE UNDERWORLD

There is a second question: Whether and how Christ descended into the underworld. First of all, all agree that Christ in some way descended into the underworld. For, the Scriptures passim teach this, as in Acts 2:27: *You will not abandon my soul to Hades.* And Eph. 4:9: *He descended into the lower parts of the earth.* And especially in the Apostles Creed we read: *He descended into hell.*

However, it should be observed that this phrase formerly was not in the Creed in all the Churches. For Irenaeus in book 1, chapter 2 and Origen at the beginning of his περί άρχών, that is, *On Principles,* and Tertullian at the beginning of his book against Praxeas, and in his book of the veiling of virgins, explain the rule of Faith handed on by the Apostles, and they do not mention this phrase, but they go directly from burial to his resurrection. Likewise Augustine in his book on Faith and the Creed, and in book 4 on the Creed for Catechists, does not mention this phrase, when he explains the whole Creed five times.

Ruffinus in his explanation presents and explains this phrase, but he warns us that it is not found in the Creed of the Roman Church, nor among the Orientals, but that it is contained implicitly in the article on the burial, because just as the body descended to the place for bodies, so the soul to the place for souls. In addition, Cyril in 4 and 14 of his Catechism and Chiysostom in homily 2 on the Creed present and explain this phrase, and now it is included everywhere. So also the major and minor Catechisms of Luther contain it; likewise the Catechisms of Calvin, Brentius and others. It is also included by the Centuriatorians in Centur. 1, book 2, chapter 4, Peter Martyr in his small book on the Creed; also Calvin in book 2, chapter 16 § 8 says that this article should be had among the main ones.

Similarly, this phrase is not present in the Nicene Creed, but it is in the Athanasian Creed. And since these Creeds do not conflict with each other, it is certain that at least implicitly this phrase cannot be lacking. Hence Anselm, in his book on the procession of the Holy Spirit, says that this article is not in the Nicene Creed, and nevertheless with the greatest agreement it is accepted by all the Churches in the East and in the West.

But the whole question has to do with the explanation of this article: I find four explanations of the adversaries, and they must be handled in an orderly way.

CHAPTER VII

TO DESCEND INTO THE UNDERWORLD IS NOT TO BE COMPLETELY ANNIHILATED

The first opinion is that to descend into the underworld is to perish totally and be annihilated. Brentius in the Catechism published in 1551 says—to descend into the underworld is to perish totally. And in his comments on Acts he introduces Christ saying this: *I will descend into hell, I will feel the pains of hell, and I will seem to perish completely.*

Likewise Calvin in Psychopannychia, wanting to prove that the souls of the just after leaving the body do not sleep, that is, are not annihilated, as some Anabaptists say, whom he refutes in the whole book, proves this from the soul of Christ, which after its separation from the body was not extinguished, or absorbed by death, but remained immortal; and he says that this is signified by the words in Acts 2:27, *You will not abandon my soul to Hades. These words,* he said, *give us certainty that Christ could not be extinguished by death, even according to his humanity. Death was a true separation of soul and body; moreover, the soul never lost its life—what was commended to the Father could not not be saved. The words of Peter's sermon affirm that, because he says it was impossible for him to be held by death, so that the Scripture might be fulfilled. For you will not abandon my soul to Hades. For his soul was supported by the divine power, lest it fall into corruption, and his body in the sepulcher was saved for the resurrection, etc.*

Certainly in this passage Calvin seems to understand by "Hades" the perfect extinction of the soul; for he proves that the soul of Christ in the death of the body was not extinct, because his soul was not absorbed by Hades. Therefore what does it mean for Calvin "to be absorbed by Hades" except that the soul is entirely annihilated? But right after that he explains the same thing more clearly; thus he says this: *And he offers us another argument for the immortality of his soul, when he says that Jonas, hidden for three days in the belly of the whale, is a sign of his own death. That belly is death, and therefore he had the soul saved in death.* And later he proves it from the sacrifice of Isaac: *Why is it,* he said, *that Isaac does not die, except because what is proper to man Christ showed to be immortal, that is, the soul? But the ram is an irrational animal, which was put to death in his place, is the body.*

This opinion does not need a refutation, because it is the foundation of Atheism. For if Christ, because he is supported by the Divinity, retained an immortal soul in the death of the body, then other men, who are not supported by the Divinity, in death are completely extinguished. Therefore the human soul is not immortal.

Perhaps they will say that the pious are not extinguished by death, because Christ conquered death for himself and for his own. Therefore at least all the impious are completely extinguished; and this means to descend into hell. But Calvin denies that at the end of his book, where he says that the impious also live after death, although in punishment. But this does not agree well with what he had said before: for either he does not prove well that the soul of Christ remained immortal because, being joined to the Divinity, it was not allowed to fall into hell, or it follows with certainty that the souls of

the impious, which descend into hell, are completely extinguished. Moreover, St. Peter, in Acts 2:31, did not say that the soul of Christ was not in the underworld, but that he did not stay there for a long time. And in the Creed do we not say, *He descended into the underworld?* Therefore if "to descend into the underworld" means to perish, then the soul of Christ also perished, although afterwards it was revivified. But this is exactly what the Anabaptists say; therefore Calvin's opinion both destroys itself, and prepares the way for Atheism.

CHAPTER VIII

CHRIST DID NOT SUFFER THE PAINS OF THE DAMNED

There is another opinion of the same Calvin in the Institutes, book 2, chapter 16 § 8, 9,10,11 and 12, in his small Catechism, in Psychopannychia, in the Harmony of the Gospels on Matt. 27, where he teaches that Christ is said to have descended into the underworld, because he suffered the pains of damned souls.

However, in order to get a better understanding of this, a few things should be noted. First of all, it should be observed that in Calvin there is no subterranean place for the impious—no Purgatory and also no Limbo of the Fathers. For, in book 2, chapter 16 § 9 in his Institutes he says that all these things are childish fables; a little further on we will deal with his views on this matter. But in book 3, last chapter of the Institutes and in the Psychopannychia he teaches that the pains of the damned are nothing other than the fear and anxiety of the thinking conscience that God is angry with him and hostile.

Note secondly that Christ, according to Calvin, descended into the underworld, because he perceived God as angry with him, and hostile because of us, and that, because of his fear of losing his own salvation he suffered an incredible anxiety of soul, such as one would suffer who knew that he would be lost forever. Hence also he says in book 2, chapter 16 § 10 of the Institutes that Christ uttered words of desperation. *He suffered,* he said, *the frightful sufferings in his soul of someone damned and lost.* And in § 11 he says that Christ was not sure of his salvation. *Therefore Christ,* he said, *praying with tears and a loud cry, was heard because of his fear, not that he might be preserved from death, but that he might not be absorbed like a sinner, because there he was taking our place. And certainly no more terrible abyss can be imagined than to think that you have been abandoned by God, and alienated, and when you call out not to be heard, as if he had conspired in your perdition.* And after that: *Thus by encountering the power of the devil, the horror of death and the sufferings of hell, it came about that he was victorious over them.* And in § 12: *Here,* he said, *certain rascals, although uneducated, driven more by malice than by ignorance, cry out that I have inflicted a great injury on Christ, because he did not agree in any way that he feared for the salvation of his soul, etc.* Likewise in his Harmony, when explaining Matt. 27, he says that Christ did not really despair, but he did utter a voice of desperation when he said, *My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?*

Note thirdly that, according to Calvin, Christ began to be in hell during the hour in which in the garden he began to be sad and to pray; then he descended deeper when on the Cross he cried out, *My God, my God, etc.;* then in the deepest way, when he appeared before the tribunal of God as guilty of eternal death, and received the very severe judgment of the irate God. Thus he teaches in book 2, chapter 16 §12 in the Institutes: *If someone now asks,* he said, *whether then Christ descended into hell, when he prayed earnestly for death: I respond that this was the beginning from which it can be gathered what dire and horrible sufferings he endured, when he knew he was standing guilty before the tribunal of God on our behalf.* These are his words. And although he

does not say expressly, how long Christ was in hell, still he intimates that he was there until the resurrection.

Note fourthly that Calvin attributes to this infernal suffering almost our whole redemption, so that without this descent into hell, his death on the cross would not be sufficient for our redemption. For, he says this in book 2, chapter 16 § 10 in the Institutes: *Nothing,* he said, *would have been accomplished, if Christ had suffered only a bodily death; but at the same time the price of his work was that he should experience the severity of the divine wrath.* And after that: *Hence also it was necessary that he should struggle with the power of hell and the horror of eternal death, and do it as it were with hands bound together.* He repeats the same things, and more at length in his commentaiy on Matt. 27.

This is Calvin's opinion, which Melanchthon and Brentius seem to follow, at least partially. For, Melanchthon, in the cited chapter on the Son, says twice that Christ struggles seriously with the temptation of rejection. Brentius on Acts 2 says that Christ suffered the pains of hell. And in the book on the Majesty of Christ, in the second part where he treats the Ascension, he teaches almost nothing else but that hell is not a certain place, but the state of the damned. In fact he adds that hell is eveiywhere, where there are impious persons, who are tempted concerning their eternal damnation.

Finally, from this flows that incredible blasphemy of this same apostate, which is mentioned by John Cochlaeus in his work on Luther and by Laurentius Surius in his history of the year 1527; the apostate said that Christ despaired and was damned. And perhaps in punishment for this sin Calvin at his death despaired, and cursed the day on which he began to write his books, and in his life we read in chapter 22: *Having invoked the demons,* the author said, *swearing, cursing, blaspheming, he died miserably. Those who served the dying man until his last breath forbade that there be any testimony about this. And this should also be added, that he detested and cursed the day and the hour that he dedicated himself to studies and writing.* These are the words of Hieronymus Hermes Bolsec who wrote the life of Calvin.

This new and unheard of impiety will now be refuted. First, because the Scriptures attribute our whole salvation to the bodily blood and death of Christ himself, and after his bodily death they acknowledge no further suffering: Phil 2:8-9: *He humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Therefore God has highly exalted him, etc.*

Here you see that there is no mention of hell, but that everything is attributed to his obedience unto death, and immediately his exaltation is added. Likewise in Ps. 22:16ff. and Isa. 53:2ff. one by one all Christ's sufferings are described, but there is no mention of hell. In Matt. 16:21, Mark 9:12, Luke 9:22 the Lord predicts his passion to the Apostles, and he mentions scourging, spitting, the cross, death, and he adds immediately: *And on the third day he will rise again.* And where, I ask, did he leave the pains of the damned and the sufferings of hell? Rom. 5:8: *God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us.* Eph. 1:7: *In him we have redemption through his blood* Col. 1:20: *Through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of his cross.* Heb. 9:12: *He entered once for all into the Holy*

Place.,, thus securing an eternal redemption. 1 Pet. 1:18-19: *You were ransomed not with perishable things such as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot.* 1 John 1:7: *His blood cleanses usfi-om all sin.* Finally, Rev. 5:9: *By your blood you ransomed us for God, etc.*

See, therefore, how true it is what Calvin says, that Christ accomplished nothing by his bodily death, but by the pains of hell, since the Scriptures repeatedly inculcate that we were redeemed by the death of Christ, but the pains of hell are not even mentioned. For, the texts Calvin cites in his own favor contribute nothing to his thesis, as we shall show a little further on.

Secondly, it is proved from the circumstance of Christ's passion. For if Christ was in hell from the time of his prayer in the garden until the resurrection, and he perceived God as angiy and opposed to himself, and if he was not sure about his salvation: why did he say so boldly to Pilate, *Hereafter you will see the Son of man coming on the clouds of heaven?* (Matt. 26:64). Likewise to Pilate: *My kingdom is not of this world?* Likewise: Why does he pray to the Father for the men who crucified him? Why did he promise Paradise to the thief? Why did he commend his soul to the Father? Certainly these are not signs of someone doubting the benevolence of the Father, much less of one despairing, or having fear about his own salvation.

It is proved thirdly, because if we were redeemed by the hellish sufferings of Christ, signs of this would have had to precede it; also some Sacrament would have to exist in memory of such a benefit, as the Eucharist is in memory of the passion. Likewise, the Church would have to celebrate the memory of such an event, as she celebrates the memory of the birth, passion, death and resurrection of the Lord. Likewise, Christ would have to be depicted in the fire of hell among the damned, as he is wont to be depicted on the cross between two thieves. But we see that none of this has happened, nor so we read that it ever did happen. Therefore, the Church either was always ungrateful, or they are fictions that Calvin teaches.

Fourthly. All the Fathers, who describe the descent of Christ into the underworld, portray it as a descent of victory and triumph, and they never say anything about Christ suffering in hell. Cyril in number 14 of his Catechism said: *Death is terrified, seeing someone new descend into the underworld, not being tied down by the chains that are there. Why, O gates of hell, did you shudder upon seeing him? What unusual fear gripped you?*

Ambrose in his book on the Mysteiy of the Pasch wrote: *When the sinless Christ descended to the deep abyss of tartarus, breaking through the bolts and doors of the underworld, having destroyed the domination of death, he recalled to life from the jaws of the devil the souls conquered by sin, and so the divine triumph was composed in eternal letters.* Similar things are said by Hilaiy in book 10 on the Trinity, Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius, Chrysostom, Eusebius in Emissenus, and others in homilies on the Pasch. Therefore the opinion of Calvin, which sends Christ to the underworld not as a victor, but as a guilty criminal, is very far removed from the teaching of the Fathers

Fifth. The fundamental principle of Calvin is false, namely, that to be in hell is nothing other than to fear the irate God. For, that is the heresy condemned in Origen, according

to Jerome in his letter to Avitus. Moreover, from that principle it would follow that many people now living are already in hell, and are damned, which conflicts with the certain state of this life. For, how many are found in this life, who have convinced themselves for certain that God is angry with them? How many are there who begin to despair about their eternal salvation? Therefore are all of them now living in hell? What else is this but to deny completely the existence of hell, and to prepare the way for atheism? Finally, we shall show later on that the true hell is a subterranean place.

Sixth. If Christ uttered words of despair, certainly he seems to have sinned gravely: but how could he, through sin, have redeemed us from sin?

Calvin responds that Christ uttered words of despair, and feared for his salvation with regard to the sense of the flesh; however, he was never lacking in Faith and Hope in God, which protected him against the temptations of despair. For although he said, *Why have you abandoned me,* which are words of despair, nevertheless he also said, *My God, my God,* which are words of Faith and Hope. These are his words in his comments on Matt. 27. *But it seems to be absurd that a voice of despair escaped from Christ. The explanation is easy: although the sense of the flesh perceived destruction, still Faith remained fixed in his heart.* And after that: *This is enough, and it is very clear from the two parts of the inquiry. For, before he experiences temptation, he says in advance that he will flee to God, as his God.* And then after that he said: *He struggled with despair, but he was not vanquished.*

First of all, we object. According to Calvin, Christ truly suffered the state of the damned. For here are his words in book 2, chapter 16 § 10: *He suffered the dire punishments of a damned and lost man.* And in the same place: *The prophet speaks about a bail or possible escape in the place for the wicked; and so being submissive, he endures all the punishments, which are expected of them, but with this one exception, that he could not be held by the sorrows of death.* And in his small Catechism, in the explanation of this article he says that this is the difference between the damned and Christ—that they endure the pains eternally, but he only for a short time.

But the punishment of the damned includes essentially despair over one's salvation, as happiness includes certitude that salvation will never be lost. But hope cannot exist together with despair; therefore Christ simply despaired, or truly did not suffer the pains of the damned, and therefore, according to Calvin, he did not truly free us.

Moreover, when Christ uttered words of despair, as Calvin says in reference to Matt. 27, he uttered them either with a deliberate will, or he did not. If it was the first, then he truly despaired, and sinned. If the second, then in Christ there was a disorder of the passions, since his fear could interfere with reason, and extort a voice of despair against his will. But this is contrary to Calvin himself, who in book 2, chapter 16 § 12 in his Institutes says that the nature of Christ was perfect, and that there was no disorder of the passions in him.

Furthermore, how can it even be thought that, in the same sentence, the first part is deliberate, while the second part is undeliberate? But in that sentence, *My God why have you abandoned me,* the words "my God" are words of Faith and deliberate, according to Calvin; then how can the following words, *Why have you abandoned me,* be undeliberate

words of despair? Was Christ so imperfect and inconstant that he could not continue with five more words of Faith? *But,* Calvin said, *the force of his sorrow extorted them.* And was he not sorrowing when he said. *My God?* Therefore, why are not those words also extorted?

You can add to this that the same Calvin in his Commentary on Ps. 22 says that the words, *My God,* are a correction of what follows, *Why have you abandoned me.* But who ever heard of a correction being made before the error? Should not the correction follow the error? Therefore, those words did not slip out unwillingly, and then the Lord willingly despaired, if he did despair in any way. Therefore, Calvin has the audacity to add also to his other perverse teachings this one, namely, he attributes to the Lamb of God, who took away the sins of the world, not only sin, but also the greatest sin.

Finally, Christ, in the opinion of Calvin, doubted about his salvation, when he descended into the underworld, as we showed above from book 2, chapter 16 § 12 in the Institutes; and the same Calvin in book 3, chapter 2 § 16 in the Institutes teaches that to doubt about one's own salvation is a sin against the virtue of Faith; therefore Christ sinned against Faith. He will respond that the doubt in Christ was not deliberate, but suggested to him by the devil through temptation; for, he responds in this way in the same book 3, chapter 2 § 17 about the faithful, whom he says suffer temptations of doubts concerning the Faith.

But in the same place in § 18 Calvin says that these doubts, although they do not extinguish Faith, still they have their origin in the imperfection of Faith, which, since it does not fully fill us and occupy us, also does not free us from every fault of distrust; therefore he is forced at least to attribute to Christ imperfect Faith and the fault of distrust, since he attributes to him doubts about his own salvation. Behold, therefore, how well Calvin fights for the glory of Christ, when not only does he not attribute to him beatitude with Catholics, but not even perfect faith with the Lutherans. But now let us examine his arguments.

He takes the first argument from Isa. 53, where Christ is said to be struck by God; for, from this he concludes that God was angry with Christ and hostile to him.

First of all, I respond that Christ is said to be afflicted by the Father, not because the Father hated him, but because he allowed him to be killed for us, as the Apostle explains in Rom. 8:32: *He did not spare his own Son but gave him up for us all.* Something similar happened, when Abraham wanted to sacrifice his own son, in order to obey God; he did not hate his son, nor did the son think that he hated him, but he understood that it was being done to show obedience to God, without any anger or hatred towards himself. Secondly, I say that this affliction is referred by Jerome and by all the other Commentators only to the temporal suffering, not to the pains of hell, concerning which none of the ancient authors ever even mentioned, when they reflected on the passion of Christ. Thirdly, I say that it is a fiction invented by Calvin that all who are punished by an irate God are suffering the pains of hell; for, how often does God afflict the impious in this world, but who, because of that, are not said to be already in hell?

The second argument is taken from the same chapter 53 of Isaiah: *Upon him was the chastisement that made us whole;* therefore Christ had to make atonement for all

the punishments which our sins deserved. But our sins deserved not just the death of the body, but also the punishment of hell; Christ, therefore, experienced also the punishment of hell, and so otherwise he would be only the Redeemer of bodies.

I respond: If this argument concluded anything, the Lord should have remained eternally in hell, and suffer an almost infinite number of punishments. For we merited eternal damnation, and we are almost infinite who merited this. Therefore, as Calvin is forced to admit that one temporal punishment of Christ could satisfy for many eternal punishment, so we say that the death of the body of Christ could satisfy for the death of all souls. For, the price of the redemption paid by Christ should not be measured from the multitude, or the quality, or the long duration of the punishments, but from the dignity of the Person who suffered, and from the love with which he suffered. It does not follow that he is the Redeemer only of bodies, both because Christ suffered in mind and in body, but also because one pain of his body had infinite value.

He takes the third argument from sorrow and fear, which the Lord suffered in the garden (Matt. 26:37). For, if he feared only the death of the body, he would have been weaker than many mere men, who bravely undergo death. Certainly many martyrs exult in their sufferings, and not only martyrs, but also thieves often die with constancy. But those who are more timid, indeed tremble, but never are they so overcome and dejected that they sweat blood because of their fear; but Christ shuddered, fell to the ground, sweated blood, needed angelic consolation, and finally being in agony he prayed at length; therefore, either he was weaker than all other men, or he feared not only the death of the body, like other men, but also the danger to his soul.

I respond that the holy Fathers explained this fear of Christ in various ways, but none of them in any way ever insinuated that this fear of Christ was about the salvation of his soul. Hilary in canon 31 on Matthew says that Christ feared nothing for himself, but for the disciples, whom he foresaw were going to deny him; but when he says, *Let this chalice pass from me,* that he wanted to say, *Let it pass from me to others,* that is, *bring it about that as I drink it eagerly, so also my disciples will drink it.* Jerome in his comments on Matt. 26 says that he was sad because he saw that the Jewish people would sin seriously that night, and therefore he said: *Let this chalice pass from me,* that is, *Do not let them kill me, but some others, etc.* Ambrose on Luke 22 and Chrysostom on Matt. 26 say that Christ shuddered at the death of the body with his natural affections.

Now I respond to this argument of Calvin: If Christ could not avoid fear, and was forced to fear: rightly he would seem to be weaker than many, but that is not the case. For he feared, because he willed it; if others do not fear, it is either because God pours into them consolation that is greater than their sufferings, or because the devil benumbs the sense of some of his adherents, or because they turn their mind away from thinking about the pains, and imagine it to be elsewhere, although this is very rare.

But Christ, so that the redemption would be abundant, wanted also to suffer the punishment of sadness and fear; therefore, he neither benumbed his senses, nor did he permit that the joy in his higher self should redound to the lower self, nor did he avert his thoughts from the imminent death, but rather deliberately fixed his mind on all the impending sufferings, which without doubt was an act of supreme fortitude and chant)'.

For, as the Evangelist says in Matt. 26:37: *Taking with him Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, he began to be sorrowful and troubled.* Why did he begin to do it then, unless because he willed it then? For, even before that he knew he was going to die, for he foretold this to his disciples, and he instituted a Sacrament in memory of his passion. However, not only was he not afraid, but he also consoled his fearing disciples, as is clear from John 14 and 15. Hence also having finished his prayer, because he no longer wished to fear, he feared no longer, but he eagerly met those who intended to put him to death, and in the whole course of his passion he gave no sign of fear. Hence also we read in John 11:38 that he was deeply moved. Concerning this text, Augustine, writing in tractate 49 on John, said: *Consider the power: Christ was deeply moved because he willed it. Where the greatest power is, infirmity is manifested according to the approval of the will; in this case, he allowed himself to be deeply moved.* Read the whole sermon, where in a brilliant way he says many things about this matter.

His fourth argument is taken from Matt. 27, where Christ exclaims, *My God, my God, why have you abandoned me?* For it seems that Christ could not have uttered these words, unless he had perceived God as hostile and angry with him.

I respond that there is no mention here of the wrath of God towards the Son, but only of abandonment; for, the Godhead abandoned the humanity to suffering, and when it could have saved him from it, he refused, so that the sacrifice might be accomplished whereby the world was to be redeemed. But the Lord wanted to cry out in this manner so that we might understand that he truly suffered grave sorrows, and that he did not endure them because of his own fault; that is signified by the word "Why?" as if he were to say, *there is no cause in me for this punishment.*

The fifth argument is taken from Acts 2:24: *God raised him up, having loosed the pangs of death, because it was not possible for him to be held by it.* For, if Christ did not suffer the pains of hell, how could he be freed from them? For how is anyone freed from chains, if he was never bound by them?

I respond first of all: in Greek it is read, having loosed the pangs of death, τοῦ θανάτου, and according to Chrysostom and Oecumenius the meaning is that God, through the resurrection of Christ, freed death itself from sorrows; for, death suffered as it were sorrow, since it detained Christ whom it could not hold permanently. But perhaps a plainer meaning will be, it we say that Christ by his resurrection destroyed and dissolved death with all its sorrows, which accompany it; for he resurrected immortal and impassible.

But that Calvin by the pangs of death wants those sorrows to be understood, which the curse and wrath of God produce, which is the origin of death, and therefore of the pains of the damned, is an attempt to prove too much. For if, because the wrath of God was the cause of death, the sorrows which Christ suffered in his death were from an irate God, and could be said to be the sufferings of the damned, for the same reason all those who die, even the martyrs, would have a hostile God, and they would suffer the pains of hell. Therefore, the wrath of God is the remote and general cause of death itself, but the proximate and particular cause very often is the benevolence and special grace of God, as Augustine says in book 3, chapter 6 in *The City of God,* and elsewhere. And David

himself who sings: *Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints* (Ps. 115:15. And John heard a voice from heaven saying to him: *Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord (Rev.* 14:13). Finally, Paul said that for him death is a gain (Phil. 1:21).

I say secondly: in our Latin edition it reads, *Having loosed the pangs of hell,* which reading perhaps should be preferred to the Greek. For, Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 12 has, *the pangs of the underworld.* And Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius, and others have the same reading; and as Augustine says, it can have two meanings. One, *Having loosed the pangs of hell,* that is, *having removed the effects;* for Christ removes the pains of hell, not those by which he was held, but lest he be held. *Just as,* said Augustine, *the snares of hunters can he loosened so that they do not hold, not because they did not hold.* The second meaning is, *Having loosed the pangs of hell,* that is, those by which He himself could not be held, but by which others were held, whom he knew should be freed. There Augustine not only explains the text correctly, but he also explicitly asserts the opposite of what Calvin intended to prove.

The sixth argument is based on Heb. 5:7: *In the days of his flesh, Jesus offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears to him who was able to save him from death, and he was heard for his reverence.* For, Calvin says that the expression "for his reverence" should be understood as "he was heard for his fear," άπο της ευλαβείας, as if he said, Christ did not pray that he might not die, but that he might not be taken as a sinner, that is, lest he be damned in eternity, and he was freed from this fear of losing his eternal salvation through the hearing of the Father.

But it is necessary for Calvin to show that ευλάβεια is to be accepted for the fear of punishment; for it signifies piety and reverence, and therefore also reverential fear. For, Calvin in his comments on Luke 2:25, where we read about Simeon that he was "full of reverence" *(timoratus),* he reads it as "pious" *(pius),* and he explains it as true piety; however, the Greek word is ευλαβής.

Beza also in his Annotations on the same text has this to say: Ευλάβεια *signifies, not any kind of fear, but a fear connected with reverence rather than with trepidation of mind, which the Latins call religion.* But if that is so, why do Calvin and Beza try to accommodate this word in Heb. 5:7 to the fear of eternal death, joined together with the greatest trepidation?

But Beza insists that the word άπο, which he says cannot be used for the prepositions "for" or "because of" but must be translated as "from"; and because it seems absurd that Christ wanted to be freed from his piety and religion; therefore he thinks it should be translated as "from fear," that is, from the fear of death or damnation. But it is very easier for us to show that the word άπο with the genitive case signifies the same thing as διά with the accusative, which by the agreement of all signifies "because of," than it is for Beza to show that ευλάβεια is to be taken for the fear of punishment. For, in Matt. 13:44, Luke 24:41, and Acts 12:14 we read, άπο χαράς, *for joy,* or *because of joy;* Luke 22:45 άπο της λύπης, *because of their sorrow;* 2 Macc. 5:21 άπο της ύπερηφανίας, *because of his arrogance,* as the author explains in the same place, διά τον μετεωρισμόν της καρδίας, *because his mind was elated.*

Therefore Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius on this text explain the word to

refer to the veneration, which is due to Christ, so that the meaning is: *He was heard because he merited to be heard, since he was worthy of all honor and reverence,* or, *He was heard because of the reverence, with which he honored his Father.* And certainly it cannot be denied that Chrysostom, Theophylact and Oecumenius understood the meaning of these Greek words.

What are we to make of the fact that Erasmus also, in his Annotations on the same text, says that one must understand by the word εὐλάβεια reverence and piety? Although we do not know for certain which prayer of Christ Paul was referring to in this text, still it is probable that it was the one he poured forth in the garden before his passion; but he certainly was heard in what he asked for, namely, that the will of God should be done in his death, or that he be freed from the power of death by his resurrection.

Calvin derives his seventh argument from Hilary, who in book 2 on the Trinity says this: *The cross, death, the underworld—they are our life.* And in book 3: *The Son of God,* he said, *is in the underworld, but man is lifted up to heaven.* And in book 4 he says, through the descent of Christ into the underworld he acquired for us that death is destroyed. And at the end of the book he said: *He destroyed death in the underworld.*

I respond that the shamelessness of Calvin is astonishing in citing Hilary, since it is certain that Hilary scarcely mentioned the sufferings of the body in Christ. Certainly theologians try hard to show that the sufferings of Christ were not entirely denied by Hilary.

Moreover, in book 10 on the Trinity he explicitly refutes the heresy of Calvin, and teaches that Christ could not in any way have feared the pains of hell, and on p. 195 he said: *With Lazarus rejoicing in the bosom of Abraham, did Christ fear the infernal chaos? Such an idea is stupid and ridiculous.* And on page 203 he said: *Is it believable that you feared the infernal chaos, the hot flames, and the abyss of avenging punishments, when you were saying to the thief: this day you will be with me in paradise?* And after that: *The Lord promises immediate communion with himself in paradise, and do you want to put Christ in hell in a state of punishment?* These are the words of Hilary which are not mentioned by Calvin.

Therefore, since Hilary says that Christ's underworld is our life, and that death has been killed in the underworld, he wants to say that Christ descended into the places in the underworld in order to take the Saints out of them, and then to block that place, so that no persons will ever go there again who believe in him and love him.

CHAPTER IX

THERE IS A THIRD ERROR ABOUT CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO THE UNDERWORLD THAT MUST BE REFUTED

A third explanation follows, which is that of Bucerus on Matt. 27 and Beza on Acts 2; they teach that the sepulcher must be understood when the word "underworld" is used. Therefore, for Christ to descend into the underworld means nothing other than that he was buried.

Calvin partly follows this opinion, and partly rejects it. For, on Ps. 16:10, where we have, *You do not give me up to Sheol,* he translates it, *You will not leave my soul in the sepulcher.* And in book 2, chapter 16 § 9, with Bucerus he says it is a myth that there are subterranean places for souls, and that Christ descended down to them; however, he disagrees with this point, that the descent of Christ into the underworld, which is placed in the Creed, is only a burial, but for him it is, as we already refuted it, a descent for the punishments of the damned.

If someone asks Calvin and Beza where the souls of the justified were before the death of Christ, they will respond: they were in heaven, although they did not see God, and they are not going to see him until the day of judgment. Thus Calvin in Psychopannychia, and Beza in his book against Brentius on the majesty of Christ, on page 2 where he disputes about the Ascension.

Therefore, in order to refute this opinion three things have to be proved. First, that the underworld is subterranean places distinct from sepulchers. Second, that souls before the death of Christ were not in heaven, but in the subterranean underworld; and therefore that Christ, who descended to the place of the souls, descended into the subterranean underworld. Third, that the soul of Christ descended directly into the underworld, a place distinct from the sepulcher.

CHAPTER X

THE UNDERWORLD IS A PLACE DISTINCT FROM SEPULCHERS

Regarding the first point, by the name of the "underworld," which the Scriptures use in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, it can be understood as the place where the dead are. There is no doubt about the fact that the Latin word for the underworld is distinct from the word "sepulcher," and since it signifies something below us and beneath us, it is nothing other than the center of the earth. Necessarily the places in the underworld are understood to be places deeply subterranean. But the adversaries show little concern for the Latin word, because the Scriptures were written only in Hebrew and Greek.

The Greek word, which we have in Matt. 11:23, Luke 16:23, Acts 2:31 is, ἅδης, which word Theodore Beza concerning Acts 2:31 says ordinarily is taken for the sepulcher, but sometimes among the poets for the place of the damned. But this is complete impudence. For, I will pass over the fact that in Greek sepulcher is called τάφος and not ἅδης; hence "Epitaphs" are also called in Latin "songs," which are wont to be inscribed on sepulchers. Certainly in Matt. 11:23, when it is said of Capemarum: *And you Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? You shall be brought down to Hades,* the word ἅδης cannot be understood to be a sepulcher. For, it would be a ridiculous antithesis, since heaven is many miles distant from the surface of the earth, where Capernaum was, and a sepulcher which is only a few feet away. But the Lord intends to say that that city was going to fall as deep as it had seemed to be exalted. In Luke 16:23, where it is said that the rich man clothed in purple was in Hades in torment, the word ἅδης cannot mean a sepulcher, unless someone wants to maintain that souls are in the sepulchers with the bodies.

Add to this that Chrysostom, in his homilies on Lazarus, always understands by Hades, where the rich man was, as Gehenna. Furthermore, Lucianus in his Dialogue says that ἅδης is a place deep under the earth. Plato in book 2 of the Republic says, ἐν ὁδου δήκην δώσομεν, that is, in Hades we will give an account of our deeds. But it is certain that this account will not be given in the sepulcher. Finally, Henry Stephanus in his long defense in favor of Beza (as it seems) says that the word ἅδης can be taken for a sepulcher, but that he could find no author who used the word in that way, but he did cite many who used it for the meaning of the underworld.

Now the Hebrew word, which occurs passim in the Old Testament, is שְׁאוֹל, and Beza contends that this word is used everywhere for a sepulcher, but that is a false claim. For it signifies a pit, and generally it is used for the subterranean place of souls, and either rarely or never for a sepulcher. I will prove this first of all from the words in Gen. 37:35: *I shall go down to Sheol to my son, mourning.* There the word is שְׁאוֹלָה and it cannot be taken for a sepulcher, because he says he will go to his son, whom he thought was dead, and devoured by wild animals, and therefore he was not in a sepulcher.

Likewise in Num. 16:30: *And the ground opens its mouth and they go down alive into Sheol.* These words are understood to be about the place of the damned by Epiphanius in Ancor. (beyond the middle), Jerome in comments on Eph. 4, and by Bede on Num. 16. And certainly Epiphanius and Jerome were well versed in Hebrew, and in that place

the word is שְׁאוֹל. Likewise in Ps. 139:8: *If I ascend to heaven, you are there! If I make my bed in Sheol, you are there.* There the surface of the earth, where David now is, is contrasted to two distant places—the highest heaven, and the lowest underworld. But a sepulcher is not above the earth more than two lengths of a palm; often also marble sepulchers are placed on the earth. Likewise in Isa. 14:13 it is said to the king of Babylon, and in his place it is said to the devil: *I will ascend above the heights of the clouds... but you are brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the Pit.* There inasmuch as he is talking about the devil, Sheol cannot signify a sepulcher, because the devil is not in a sepulcher, as is well known; inasmuch as he is talking about the king of Babylon, also it cannot signify a sepulcher, both because the antithesis would be lost, and in the same place that king is said to be lacking a sepulcher.

To this can be added the consensus of almost all those who can make a decision about this matter. For, the translators of the LXX everywhere translate שְׁאוֹל with ἅδης and never with τάφος. Jerome everywhere translates it with "Hades" and never with "sepulcher." Rabbi David renders Ps. 10:6, *On the wicked he will rain coals of fire and brimstone.* And the same Rabbi David and Rabbi Abenezra on Ps. 139:8, *If I make my bed in Sheol,* say that it is Hades. And Rabbi Levi on Prov. 15:24 and Job 26:6 explain that by שְׁאוֹל is meant the subterranean place for souls.

Likewise, the same point is confirmed by Calvin himself, the teacher of Beza; for in Psychopannychia he says that שְׁאוֹל sometimes is used for "sepulcher," but most often for the state of the damned.

What are we to think, if Beza beautifully contradicts himself? For, he wrote two books which are usually placed together in the same volume; one is against Sebastian Castalionis, concerning his version of the New Testament; the other is against Brentius, concerning the omnipresence of the body of Christ. In book 1, while considering the verse in Acts 2:31, *You will not abandon my soul in Hades,* he says that those who do not understand that Hades means "sepulcher" are going about blind in the middle of the day. And when the passage in Luke 16:23 about the rich man and Lazarus is put to him as an objection, he contends that there also a sepulcher is meant by the word "Hades." And when Christ says that the rich man was in torments, Beza says that Christ is speaking figuratively, as if he would place for us the sepulcher of the rich man in the middle of flames, in which not a cadaver, but a live man is contained, when however really there was nothing in the sepulcher except a lifeless body; and he speaks about another place, which is not the sepulcher of the Scriptures, and says it is to imagine Orcus and Erebus with the fables of the poets.

But in his book against Brentius he now assumes a contrary person, and says that they are going about blind at midday who, from the history of Lazarus and the rich man in Luke 16 do not conclude to the true place of hell, where the damned are tormented. And in the same place he defends Bullingerus, who based on Num. 16 had proved that the underworld contains true subterranean places, since the word for that is K# Likewise in the same place he cites Ps. 139:8, *If I make my bed in Sheol,* that is, Hades, in order to prove the existence of hell against Brentius; and nevertheless there also is the Finally, he fights no less for a true underworld that is corporeal, localized and

subterranean in order to contradict Brentius, than he does elsewhere to destroy a true and localized underworld, or to change it into a sepulcher, in order to oppose us.

Secondly, I prove that there is an underworld besides sepulchers from the name of the abyss. For, in Luke 8:31 the demons begged Jesus not to command them to depart into the abyss. It is certain that the abyss is a deep pit, and therefore below the surface of the earth. Likewise, it is certain that it is not a sepulcher, for sepulchers are no prepared for demons. Finally, it is certain that the abyss is not something spiritual, as Brentius claims, spread out everywhere; for then the demons would not have begged not to be sent into the abyss. Therefore, what remains but that the abyss is a very deep subterranean pit?

Thirdly, I prove my thesis from Rev. 5:3, where we read that no one could be found to open the scroll: *No one in heaven or on earth or under the earth was able to open the scroll* And after that: Every creature gave praise to God *in heaven and on earth and wider the earth* (v.13). And in Phil 2:10: *At the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth.* In these places the word καταχθονίων means nothing other than subterranean. And certainly they are not cadavers in sepulchers, who were not able to open the scroll, or who are praising God, and are bending their knees at the name of Jesus; therefore they are spirits, who are called subterranean, because they live in subterranean places.

Fourthly, I prove it from the Fathers. Irenaeus in book 5 near the end says that Christ descended to the lower parts of the earth, where the souls were. Tertullian in chapter 45 of his Apology calls the underworld the subterranean treasure of hidden fire. Cyril in his book on the right Faith to Theodotius calls the underworld, where the souls are, a subterranean cave. Amobius in book 2 against the Gentiles said: *You will hear us ridiculed, when we speak about Gehenna and the inextinguishable fires, etc.* And after that, concerning Plato, he says this: *It is not beyond belief that those souls are thrown into flowing rivers of flames, into hideous dirty pits.* Ambrose in comments on Eph. 4 says that Christ descended into the underworld, into the heart of the earth to preach to the dead. Nyssa says the same thing in Oration 1 on the resurrection. Jerome on Isa. 14 said: *We are saying that hell is below the earth.* Augustine in book 2, chapter 24 or his Retractions said: *It seems to me that I should have said more about hell, which is under the earth, than to give an explanation why they are believed or said to be under the earth, as if that were not the case.* Gregory in book 4, chapter 42 in his Dialogues, Bede in book 3, chapter 7 on Job, Primasius on Rev. 7, and Damascene in book 3, last chapter, all say that hell is under the earth.

Finally, we can also consult natural reason. Since it is in accordance with reason that the place of demons and of wicked and reprobate men is situated very far away from the place in which the angels and blessed men will be forever, we do not doubt that the place of the blessed (even by the admission of our adversaries) is heaven; and nothing is farther removed from heaven than the center of the earth.

CHAPTER XI

THE SOULS OF THE PIOUS WERE NOT IN HEAVEN BEFORE THE ASCENSION OF CHRIST

Regarding the second ροίηζ that the souls of the pious were not in heaven before the Ascension of Christ, it is proved first of all because it is an opinion absolutely unheard of in the Church of God; surely that should be sufficient to refute it. Moreover, in Gen. 37:35 Jacob says: *I shall go down to Sheol to my son.* Jacob was pious and Joseph was pious; nevertheless, both did not ascend into heaven, but Scripture says they went down to Sheol. Likewise in Luke 16, when the rich man is in hell, he sees far off the soul of Lazarus in the bosom of Abraham, and he sees that between those two places there is a huge hiatus; for that is the meaning of the word χάσμα. From this it is apparent that there was no solid object or wall between the place of the damned and the bosom of Abraham, but both souls were in the same abyss, although far removed from each other. Likewise in 1 Sam. 28:13-14 the soul of Samuel appearing to Saul is seen arising from the earth.

Although there are not lacking those who deny that that was the true soul of Samuel, nevertheless the contrary opinion is more common and probable and safe. For, that is taught by Josephus in book 6, chapter 15 in the Antiquities, Justin in the Dialogue with Trypho, Basil in letter 80 to Eustachius, Ambrose in his comments on Luke 1, Jerome on Isa. 7, and Augustine in chapter 15, *On Care to Be Had for the Dead.* Among the more recent authors there are also Liranus, Abulensis, Dionysius the Carthusian, and Cajetan in their comments on this place. And it is deduced with sufficient clarity from the text of the divine Scripture: *When the woman had seen Samuel.* Then: *Samuel said to Saul.* And also: *Saul knew that it was Samuel.* Certainly Scripture would not say "he knew," but "he thought" or "he assumed," if it were not true.

Furthermore, in Sir. 46:20 Samuel is praised because, even after his death, he prophesied and revealed to the king what was going to happen. But what praise would there be for Samuel, if it were not he who prophesied future events, but some demon appearing in his form? And it seems to be incredible that the soul of such a prophet was subject to the incantations of a medium. That surely is true, and therefore the apparition of Samuel preceded the incantation and its effect. This can be understood by the excitement of the woman, who was upset when she saw Samuel appeared before he was called forth.

Moreover, the same thing is clear from 1 Pet. 3:19-20: *He went and preached to the spirits in prison, who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah, during the building of the ark.* Here the souls are said to be in prison; therefore they were not in heaven, for it is ridiculous to say that the souls in heaven were held as it were in a prison, since heaven is the seat of God. This is so notwithstanding that here it seems to be speaking about the spirits of the impious; for, Calvin admits that it is dealing with the spirits of the justified. But we will consider this text later on.

Likewise in Zech. 9:11: *As for you also, because of the blood of my covenant with you, I will set your captives free from the waterless lake.* Jerome and Rupertus in their Commentaries explain this text as being about the descent of Christ into the underworld. And surely from this it is certain that the souls of the Saints before the death of Christ

were not in heaven, as Calvin and Beza claim; for, heaven cannot be signified by the waterless lake, nor does the Lord lead his Saints out of heaven, nor are any bound in heaven.

But what Calvin says in book 2, chapter 16 § 9 in his Institutes that the waterless lake is said by Zechariah to be the depth of the Babylonian Captivity, from which the Jews were liberated, has no probability. For, in the preceding words a prophecy about Christ is placed: *Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion... Behold, your king comes to you, etc.* The Evangelists explain this to be about the entrance of Christ into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:5; John 12:15); hence there follows this apostrophe to Christ himself: *And for you also, because of the blood of my covenant.* Therefore, how do those things hang together, if the concern is with the Babylonian captivity? And also in what blood of the Testament were the Jews liberated from Babylon?

Finally, the Fathers by common consent teach this matter. For example: Irenaeus in book 5 near the end, Tertullian in book 4 on Marcion, Origen on Rom. 5, Cyril in number 4 of his Catechism and in his other book on the right Faith at the end of the texts from Matthew, Hilary in book 10 on the Trinity, Basil on Ps. 49, Athanasius in the letter to Epictetus, Epiphansius in Heresies 46, Ambrose in book 3, chapter 3 on Faith, Jerome in comments on Zech. 9 and Sir. 3, Primasius on Rev. 5, Gregory in book 13, chapter 21 on Morality, the Council of Toledo IV in chapter 1. Finally, Augustine, although in letter 99 he seems to be uncertain whether the bosom of Abraham, where the souls of the Fathers were formerly, was in the underworld or elsewhere; however, in book 20, chapter 15 in *The City of God,* he says that they were in the underworld, as all the other Fathers always taught; we will quote his words on this in the following chapter.

CHAPTER XII

IT IS SHOWN FROM THE SCRIPTURES THAT CHRIST REALLY DESCENDED INTO THE UNDERWORLD

Regarding the third point I will prove from the Scriptures that Christ really descended into the underworld. The first place, which however is not convincing but has probability, is found in the words of Ps. 107:16: *He shatters the doors of bronze, and cuts in two the bars of iron.* Hilaiy in his comments on Ps. 138 and Ambrose in his book on the mystery of the Pasch, and others, understand this verse to be about the descent into the underworld, but in a mystical sense: for, literally, it is certain that it is dealing with the exodus from Egypt.

The second place is Sir. 24:45 where the wisdom of God says this: *I will penetrate all the lower parts of the earth, and I will look at all those sleeping, and I will enlighten all those hoping in the Lord.* This text does not convince the heretics; both because they do not recognize this book, and also because these words are missing in the Greek text, but among Catholics it does have its own authority.

The third place adduced is from Matt. 12:40: *As Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, so will the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.* Calvin in his Psychopannychia says that the belly of the whale was a figure of speech for death, which detained Christ for three days. But Christ says that the belly of the whale is like the heart of the earth; the heart of the earth is not death, but some place under the earth.

Others say that the sepulcher is called the heart of the earth; but this likeness is not valid. For, the heart is in a deep place of an animal; but a sepulcher is near the surface of the earth, and Christ's sepulcher seems to have been hewn out of rock existing on the earth. Likewise: As Jonah was living in the belly of the whale, so something living should be in the heart of the earth. But a dead body was in the sepulcher; therefore, the heart of the earth is not the sepulcher, but the underworld much deeper than a sepulcher, and the living soul of Christ stayed there for three days. Moreover, Jerome said concerning Jonah 2: *As the heart of animals is in the middle, so the underworld is shown to be in the middle of the earth.* This place is explained in the same way by Irenaeus in book 5 near the end, Tertullian in chapter 31 of his book on the soul, Nyssa in Oration 1 on the Resurrection, and Ambrose on Eph. 4.

The fourth place is Acts 2:27: *You will not abandon my soul to Hades.* Beza translates it, *You will not abandon my dead body in the sepulcher.* And in defense of this version he said against Sebastian Castalionis: *Here no one can doubt that he is talking about the body in the sepulcher, unless one wants to walk about blind at midday.* And just before that, in giving the reason why he changed soul to dead body, and Hades to sepulcher, he said: *I did not act rashly, since we see that this text especially has been distorted by the Papists to establish their own thesis, and the Ancients also deduced from that the descent of Christ's soul into the underworld.*

The decision of the Rabbis seems to have pleased Beza, namely, that it is stated by Rabbi Salomone, in chapter 21 of his comments on 2 Samuel, that it is good to change something in the Law, so that God may be publicly sanctified. But we consider first of all the property of the words; for in the Greek text of Acts 2:27 ψυχή signifies properly the soul, and άδης designates

properly the underworld; this does not need any proof, since all dictionaries can be consulted.

Beza responds: although ψυχή properly signifies the soul, nevertheless, it can be taken for the body in three ways. First, because the soul is taken for life; but life, with respect to the body, seems to be buried by the sepulcher no less than the body. Second, because the whole can be understood from the soul, and so it is the same thing to say "you will not abandon my soul," and "you will not abandon me." Again, the part can be understood from the whole, and so it will be the same thing to say "you will not abandon me," and "you will notabandon my dead body." Third, because ψυχή in Greek, and WM in Hebrew signify the same thing. In addition, WM is found in Scripture used for a dead body in Lev. 21:1 and 11, where we read that the Law forbids dead bodies to be touched, and it calls them souls.

But that quibbling proves nothing. For even ifthe body could be understood for the soul, still because ofthat it could not be proved immediately that it has that meaning in this place. Moreover, here the soul is distinguished from the body, since it is said shortly thereafter that his soul was not abandoned in the underworld, nor did his body see corruption. For this is the way it is expressed in Greek; therefore, in this place the soul cannot be taken for the body. Also, the word ἅδης (as we showed above) always means the underworld, never a sepulcher; but the body ofChrist was not in the underworld, therefore the soul was there. Furthermore, Ambrose in Sermon 74 on martyrs, Jerome on Psalm 16, Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius, Bede on Acts 2, and others, explain it in terms ofthe soul being in the underworld.

To the first reason of Beza I respond: although the soul can be taken for the life, because it gives life to the body, still it is never used for a dead body, because in a cadaver there is an absence oflife. And we cannot say that life is in the sepulcher, since the body is there without life; for, contraries must not be put together at the same time.

To the second reason I say that grammar does not permit that dialectical reasoning, namely, the part is taken for the whole, and the whole for the part, therefore the part for the part. For, words are used at pleasure, and depend on the use ofthe speakers; but use does allow synecdoche, whereby we place the part for the whole, and vice versa, but it does not allow a part for a part. For who would agree, ifwe were to say that a man sees with his feet, because the foot can be used for a man, and a man for an eye?

To the third reason I say that there is a big difference between DM and ψυχή. For, is a veiy general word, and it signifies without any trope both the soul and an animal, indeed also the body, as is clear from many texts ofScripture. Hence almost always the substantive *nephes* is modified by the adjective "living," which is proper to the whole composite. Thus in Gen. 1:20: *Let the waters bringforth swarms ofliving creatures.* And in verse 24: *Let the earth bringforth living creatures.* And in 2:7: *And the man became a living being.* In these places it would be useless to add the adjective "living," unless the Hebrew word MU? which the translator rendered as "soul" signified something indifferent to living and non-living. Thus in Num. 23:10 Balaam says: *Let my soul die the death ofthe righteous.* And in Num. 31:35 all the souls ofthe feminine sex from the booty ofMidian were thirty-two thousand.

In addition, the human soul cannot die, and it does not have sex; therefore in those places the soul does not signify another part of man, but the whole man, or it certainly signifies the body. Likewise, in Gen 37:22: *Let us not kill his soul:* where soul is not said properly about the soul, nor for man by a trope, since the pronoun "his" argues against

that, but it is taken properly for the body. The Greek ψυχή, like the Latin *anima* is not so general in meaning that without a trope it could be used for the whole animal. Therefore in Leviticus a part is not used for a part, that is, soul for the body, but a word, which usually signifies the body itself, or certainly where the whole is used for a part, that is, "living" for the body. But in Acts 2:27 ψυχή is used, which signifies the soul only.

Furthermore, also *nephes,* when it is opposed to the flesh, cannot be taken for the flesh, as in Lev. 17:11: *The soul of the flesh is in the blood.* But here the soul is opposed to the flesh, since it is said, the soul has not been abandoned in Hades, and the flesh has not seen corruption. Therefore, in this place the interpretation of Beza can in no way be admitted, since he wants to understand cadaver for soul.

The fifth place is Rom. 10:6-7: *Do not say in your heart... Who will descend into the abyss, that is, to bring Christ up from the dead?* Therefore Christ after his death was in the abyss. But by the name of "abyss" the status of the damned cannot be understood, for, according to Calvin, Christ was still living in it; but here the point concerns the place where he was only when he was dead. And it cannot be understood as the sepulcher, for "abyss" signifies a very deep pit, which is not a sepulcher.

Moreover, it was easy to enter a sepulcher, but here "to descend into the abyss" is stated as something impossible for a living man. Finally, in this place the abyss is opposed to heaven, as the surface of the earth is in the middle place between the abyss and heaven. For, this precedes: *Who will ascend into heaven, that is, to bring Christ down;* and this follows immediately as the antithesis: *Who will descend into the abyss, that is, to bring Christ up from the dead.* Therefore, after his death and before his resurrection Christ was in the abyss, which is very far away from heaven, that is, in the deepest parts of the earth.

The sixth place is at Eph. 4:9: *In saying "He ascended," what does it mean but that he had also descended into the lower parts of the earth.* To this Beza responds in his Annotations on this verse that the lower parts of the earth are a sepulcher. Augustine Maloratus understands the descent to this earth, as if it were said, he descended to this lowest earth.

But first of all, we have Jerome, Ambrose, Chiysostom, and Theophylact who explain it as the underworld, below which there is nothing. Secondly, we have the meaning of the words: for, the lower part of the world does not signify the whole earth, but one part, which is lower than others. Therefore, it does no signify the surface of the earth, which is the upper part, nor also the sepulcher of Christ which was above the earth. Thirdly, what follows works in our favor, namely, *that he might fill all things.* For, Christ wanted to descend into the true underworld, as he had descended to the earth, so that, being present, he might visit all parts of his kingdom, which is tripartite, according to Phil. 2:10: *That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth.* There in Greek, as we said above, is the word καταχθονίων, that is, subterranean; by this word dead bodies cannot be understood, which are in sepulchers; also, they cannot bend the knee at the name of Jesus, that is, show him honor. Therefore there are some spirits in subterranean places, who ought to show reverence to Chriſ and Christ descended to that place, in order that he might declare himself to be the king and Lord of the whole world.

CHAPTER XIII

THE EXPLANATION OF A VERY OBSCURE PLACE IN 1 PETER 3 AND 4

To the testimonies of Scripture, whereby the descent of Christ into the underworld is proved, can be added this passage of St. Peter: *Christ also died for sins once for all, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh but made alive in the spirit; in which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who formerly did not obey, when God's patience waited in the days of Noah,* 1 Pet. 3:18-20. It seems that another text from chapter 4:6 should be added to this one: *For this is why the gospel was preached even to the dead, that though judged in the flesh like men, they might live in the spirit like God.* But in order for this passage, which has always been considered very obscure, to be understood, three explanations ought to be discussed.

The first explanation is that of St. Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius, which Bede follows. So Augustine explains that by spirits held in prison he understands the men, who lived during the time of Noah, whose souls were in the mortal body as in a prison; for the body is like a prison of the soul, and he says that Christ, not in his humanity, which he had not yet assumed, but in his Divinity preached by an internal inspiration, or by the tongue of Noah to those men, who however were unbelieving. Therefore, Augustine doe< not want to refer this passage to the underworld.

I would not refute this explanation, if it were totally pleasing to Augustine himself; but he confesses that he did not understand this passage, and he asks that the reason be sought as to how this place could pertain to the underworld. Therefore, with Augustine not only permitting, but also requesting it, we will briefly refute this first explanation. First, this explanation is not pleasing, because the common view of the Fathers is opposed to it. For, Clement of Alexandria in book 6 near the middle of the Stromata, Athanasius in the letter to Epictetus, and in the book on the Incarnation which begins with, *Mos pH hominis,* Epiphanius in Heresies 77, Cyril in his book on the right Faith and in book 12, chapter 36 on John, Hilary on Ps. 119:82 on the words, *My eyes fail with watching for your promise; I ask, When will you comfort me?,* Ambrose on Rom. 10, Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed, and Oecumenius in his comments on this passage—they all explain it as being about the descent of Christ into the underworld, where the spirits of the dead are thought to be.

Moreover, Justin in the Dialogue with Trypho and Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 23 cite certain words of Isaiah, which however are not found, similar to those words of St. Peter, so that it might be credible that St. Peter took them from there. Here are the words: *The holy Lord of Israel remembered his dead, who slept in the land of burial, and he descended to preach to them salvation, which is from him, in order to save them.*

Secondly, this opinion is not proved, because Christ is said to have gone in spirit to preach to the spirits; for this refers to the phrase "in which," that is, coming in the spirit, etc., but the spirit, which here is distinguished from the flesh, does not seem to be able to signify anything other than the soul; therefore, the Lord went to preach to the spirits not in his divinity alone, but also in his soul.

St. Augustine for this very reason says he is moved to this point—that he does not understand by this spirit the soul of Christ; for, when it is said, *but made alive in the spirit,* if "spirit" signified the soul, then it would mean that at one time the soul of Christ was dead, since nothing is vivified unless it was dead. Therefore, he says that the meaning is that Christ was dead in the flesh, because he died according to the flesh, and he was made alive in βρίπζ because by the power of the Spirit of God he was raised from the dead.

But this reason is not conclusive; for, in Scripture passim it is said that what is not killed is vivified. Thus in 1 Sam. 27:9: *David did not vivify either man or woman,* that is, *he did not leave them alive.* And in 2 Sam. 8:2 David is said to have *measured Moab with two lines, one line to be put to death, and one line to be vivified,* that is, to define how many Moabites he wanted to kill, and how many to become servants. And in Acts 7:19: *He forced our fathers to expose their infants, that they may not be vivified,* that is, that they not be kept alive, but all be killed. Therefore St. Peter wants to say that Christ was put to death in the flesh, but kept alive in the spirit in the passion, because the flesh remained dead, but the soul could not be killed, but remained alive, and acting, and triumphing in the underworld.

Thirdly, this opinion is not pleasing, because the expression "he went and preached," if it is understood to be about the soul, can be understood properly; for truly he went to a place where he was not; but if it is about the Divinity, then it can be understood only improperly. Moreover, the word in Greek is πορευθείς, that is, "he went," and this same word is repeated a little bit later, when it is said that he has gone into heaven, etc., but in this second place it is taken properly; therefore it is also taken properly in the first place.

Fourthly, because by the spirits who were in prison, it does not seem possible that living men are meant, unless St. Peter deliberately strove for impropriety and obscurity; but certainly when we have a proper and easy meaning, it is not allowed to propose tropes. You can add that in 1 Pet. 4:6, when Peter is speaking, he says: *For this is why the gospel was preached even to the dead.* And although Augustine by the "dead" wants those who died in sins to be understood, who however still live in their bodies; nevertheless, the preceding sentence seems to deny that, for he says: *They will give account to him who is ready to judge the living and the dead. For this is why the gospel was preached even to the dead.* But when we say that Christ is the judge of the living and the dead, we understand it literally that he will judge those who are living, and those who have truly and really died, as the same Augustine teaches in chapter 55 of the Enchiridion. Therefore, Christ preached to the truly dead, that is, he descended into the true underworld.

Fifthly, if this place is understood to be about the preaching done in the days of Noah, it is not apparent why this narration is inserted here. For, how do these things hang together—that Christ in his passion died according to the flesh, but in spirit he remained living, therefore God formerly preached to men through Noah? But if we understand it to be about his descent into the underworld, it all hangs together; for, while Peter wants to show that Christ in his passion and death remained living as to his soul, he proves it, because at that time his soul went into the underworld, and he preached to the spirits confined in prison.

But Augustine objects: because there does not seem to be a reason why he preached

only to those who were unbelievers at the time of Noah, since so many others were in hell. Likewise, because it seems very absurd, that Christ preached in hell. For it would seem to follow from that, that the Church also should be constituted in hell, where souls are converted and reconciled. But Augustine proves that something absurd follows from our opinion, because the bosom of Abraham, where all the righteous were, does not seem to have been in hell, but to be very far away from hell, since there was a great chasm between the rich man dwelling in hell and Lazarus rejoicing in the bosom of Abraham. Therefore, if this place about the descent into the underworld is to be understood, Christ preached only to sinners; but he did not preach in vain, nor without fruit; therefore he converted some: but this can in no way be asserted. Therefore it is manifest that this passage does not refer to the descent into the underworld. And this is the great difficulty which forced Augustine to distance himself from the common opinion; for he feared lest he be forced to admit the conversion and reconciliation of the damned spirits.

I respond that the first objection can be rebutted in this way: for, there also does not seem to be any reason why Peter says that Christ preached in the days of Noah rather than in the days of Abraham, and the other patriarchs, or also of all other men.

I say further that Christ preached in the underworld to all the good spirits, but by name those are mentioned who were unbelieving in the days of Noah, because about them there was more doubt about whether or not they were saved, since they were punished by God, and drowned in the waters of the flood. Therefore here St. Peter indicates that there were some of those unbelievers who also at the end of their life repented, and although with regard to the body they died, still with regard to the soul they were saved, which Jerome also teaches in questions about the Hebrew in Genesis when he is treating 6:3: *My spirit shall not abide in man, etc.* There he says that God punished many of them temporally with the waters of the flood, and that he should not punish them eternally in Gehenna. And the words in 1 Pet. 4:6 seem to have this meaning: *For this is why the gospel was preached even to the dead, that though judged in the flesh like men, they might live in the spirit like God,* that is, as according to men they will be judged exteriorly in the flesh, that is, according to human judgment they are thought to be damned, because their bodies were killed by the waters; however, they live in the spirit according to God, that is, their souls have been saved in the eyes of God.

To the second objection I say that Augustine himself afterwards admitted that the bosom of Abraham was in hell, as is clear from his tractate on Ps. 86 and in book 20, chapter 15 of *The City of God,* and this is the opinion of all the Fathers and of the whole Church. Therefore I say that the preaching of Christ in the underworld was not to convert infidels, but was only to announce a great joy to the pious souls, to whom he announced that the redemption had been completed, so that they would understand that now they would be freed from there and at the proper time would also receive their bodies. This is enough on the explanation of St. Augustine, which we have refuted, but following his mind, not his words.

The second explanation is that of Beza in his Annotations on this place, where he gives this explanation: *Christ in the spirit,* that is, *in his divinity, went and preached to the spirits in prison,* that is, *to the spirits who are now in the prison of hell,* but then

when he preached to them, they were not in prison but in the body, that is, when the ark of Noah was being made. Beza so prides himself on this explanation in defense of his book against Castalionis, that because of it he says he has received thanks though many letters sent to him.

But this does not differ from the view of St. Augustine, except in three ways. First, Augustine proposed his view as doubtful, and as one to be held until a better explanation is found; Beza says that his view is certain. Second, Augustine abides by the text he finds written in the major codices; Beza in his audacity changes it, and where we have, 07io were *in prison,* he says it reads, *Who are in prison.* And although in the Greek there is no verb, still all the Latin authors until now have read it as "were," but not as "are." Since they said that they were freed from prison by Christ, it could not truly be said at the time of Peter about those spirits that they were then in prison. Third, Augustine by the word "prison" understood the mortal body, but Beza understands it as "underworld"; on this point he agrees with us. Therefore, the opinion of Beza, to the extent that it differs from that of St. Augustine, does not need a refutation, because it agrees with us; to the extent that it agrees with ίζ it has already been refuted.

Also his arguments are easily answered from what has been said. First of all he objects, because Christ is said to have come in the Spirit. I respond: we have already shown that in this text Spirit signifies soul. Second, because there is mention only of infidels, for whom the descent into the underworld would not be of any benefit. I respond: we have already said that they formerly were unbelievers, but afterwards converted to God and died piously. Third, he objects that nothing is said here about the liberation of souls. I respond that the preaching of Christ was nothing other than the announcement of liberation. Fourth, he objects that it is absurd to preach to the dead, who cannot be converted. I respond that he did not preach so that the impious might be converted, but so that the souls of the pious might rejoice.

The third explanation is that of Calvin in book 2, chapter 16 § 9 in his Institutes and in Psychopannychia, where he says that, according to the words of Peter, Christ preached to the spirits of the dead, both good and evil, not because he came to them through the presence of his soul, but because he caused them to feel the effect of his passion and death, and that the good would receive joy, and the evil sadness.

And because someone could say: why are the souls of the pious said to be in prison, since according to Calvin they were always in heaven? He will respond that the phrase "in prison" should be translated as "in hope"; for, the Greek word φυλακή signifies both prison, and also vigilance, observation, keeping watch. Therefore the souls of the pious are said to have been keeping watch, because they were in constant expectation of the passion of Christ. He adds moreover that it could also be said that they were in prison, because, like being under a cloud and shade, from a great distance they were looking for light, so that their expectation could be called a type of prison.

Calvin says that this explanation is such that he is fully confident it will persuade all good men. But he was a false prophet, because he did not persuade even his very close friend and successor, Beza. That is so because Calvin by spirit understands efficacy, Beza divinity; Calvin by prison, heavenly expectation, Beza infernal custody; Calvin by *spirits*

in prison, the souls of the pious, Beza the souls of the damned. Calvin says it took place at the death of Christ, Beza says at the time of Noah. Therefore, either Beza is not a good man, or Calvin did not persuade all good men.

But even without considering those point, Calvin's explanation can be refuted easily. First of all, because by the word "spirit" efficacy cannot be understood, but soul; this is so because here it is distinguished both from the body as from another part of the same composite, and also because here it is said that Christ went in the spirit to preach, where the word "went" indicates the change of the person from one place to another.

Secondly, it is false that φυλακή signifies vigilance in the meaning that Calvin gives to it; for, φυλακή properly means "custody" and it is derived from the verb φυλάττω, which means *I keep guard, I keep watch,* etc., and hence it is translated to signify everything that pertains to custody and guarding, such as prisons and places of detention, but it cannot signify simple expectation or watching, which is not related to guarding. And Calvin will not easily find an example in good authors for his translation of "expectation."

But it is ridiculous when he says that waiting in the shade can be said to be in prison. For according to that, during the night while we wait for day, all of us would be in prison; and also, the souls of the pious, even though in a rather obscure way they looked into the distance for Christ, nevertheless they saw many other things clearly, and were in the light absolutely. But how, in the opinion of Calvin, could they be said to be in the darkness, or in prison, if they were in heaven? And who thinks there is darkness and prison in heaven?

Thirdly, the opinion of Calvin destroys itself, because he is saying two things. First, that the spirits in prison are the souls of the pious waiting for Christ, and that Christ announced joy to them. Secondly, he says that Christ by his preaching terrified the souls of the impious, and that this is signified by these words: *Who formerly did not obey during the building of the ark.* But Peter is speaking about the same persons, since he says this: *In which he went and preached to the spirits in prison, who formerly did not obey, etc.* In the Greek it is expressed with a participle, ἀπειθήσασιν, which means *disobedient* or *unbelieving.* Therefore, it is necessary that in that prison were those who formerly were disobedient, and if they are the spirits of the impious, it follows necessarily either that the spirits of the impious were in that heavenly expectation, or that the word φυλακή does not mean *expectation,* but *prison.*

Finally, it should be noted that this opinion is singular and contrary to that of all the ancient authors. Therefore, let the decision of the Fathers remain, which teaches that Christ preached to the holy Fathers in the prison of the underworld.

CHAPTER XIV

THE TRADITION OF THE FATHERS ON THE DESCENT OF CHRIST INTO THE UNDERWORLD

Now what we have proved from the Scriptures we will briefly confirm from the tradition of the Fathers. In the first place we have the Apostles' Creed, which is accepted by the heretics, where, after mentioning his burial, it says, *he descended into hell;* therefore, to be buried and to descend into hell are not one and the same thing. And it cannot be said that the second statement is a repetition of the first one. For the Creed is a brief summaiy of the Faith, in which it would be a grave fault for something to be repeated. And the latter sentence cannot be an explanation of the former, because then the known would be explained by the unknown.

Besides the Creed, we have two Councils: for, Toledo IV in chapter 1 says this: *He descended into hell to free the holy ones being held there.* And Lateran IV under Innocent III in chapter 1 said: *He descended into hell, rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven; but he descended in the soul, rose again in the body, and ascended equally in both.*

Moreover, all the Fathers teach this. Thaddeus, a disciple of the Lord, in book 1, last chapter, of Eusebius's History, while teaching the Faith of Christ, among other things said this: *He descended into hell, and disrupted their distress, which for centuries no one had disrupted; surely he descended alone, but he ascended with a great multitude.* This cannot be understood to be about the sepulcher; for a body in a sepulcher does not disrupt distress, nor does it ascend from there with a multitude. Therefore, Thaddeus is speaking about the descent into the underworld, from which a multitude of the holy Fathers ascended with Christ.

Ignatius in his letter to the Trallians said: *He was truly crucified, and died, in the sight of beings in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth.* Likewise: *He descended into hell alone, but he returned with a multitude.* Justin in Dialogue with Trypho where he complains that the testimony of Jeremiah had been erased by the Jews, in which the Lord was said to have descended into hell to liberate his dead.

Irenaeus in book 5, chapter 31 said: *The Lord observed the law of the dead, so that he might be the first-born from the dead, and he remained in the lower parts of the earth until the third day, etc.* And so that they might not say he was speaking about the sepulcher, he adds: *When the Lord went down into the middle of the shadow of death, where the souls of the dead were, etc.* Clement in book 6 of the Stromata said: *The Lord preached to those who were in the underworld.* And it is certain that the body in the sepulcher did not preach.

Origen in homily 15 on Genesis said: *The only-begotten Son for the salvation of ht world descended into the underworld, and from there he called back the first man. For, what he said to the thief, "today you will be with me in paradise," was not said to tin alone, but understand that it was also for all the Saints, for whom he descended into the underworld.* You will find the same view in book 2 against Celsus, and in book 5 of hi:

commentary on Romans.

Eusebius in book 4, chapter 12 of the demonstration of the Gospel said: *Unto death and unto the dead themselves, the laws of charity summoned him that he should call back the souls also of those who had died before him.* Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechism #4, after he had spoken about the burial, then added: *He descended into the underworld that he might liberate the righteous from there, etc.* See also Catechism #14.

Athanasius in his book on the Incarnation, which begins with *Mos pii hominis,* near the middle, says this: *Believe that the soul is the interior man, since it is made known both from the first formation, and from the second dissolution, since not only in us, but also in the body of Christ this is evident—that the body is not outside the sepulcher, while the soul descends into the underworld, two places separated by a huge chasm. The sepulcher receives what was corporeal, but the underworld what was incorporeal, etc.* And after that he teaches that Christ descended into the underworld to liberate souls.

Basil on Ps. 45:8 in explaining the words "myrrh and aloes and cassia" said: *Therefore the fragrance of Christ breathes forth myrrh because of the passion, but aloes because he did not remain immobile or inefficacious three days and three nights, but descended into the underworld by the grace of the dispensation concerning the resurrection, in order to fill the universe with himself.* And after that: *Therefore he received myrrh because of his burial, and fragrant oil because of his descent into the underworld.* And on Ps. 49:15 when explaining the words, *God will ransom my soul from the power of Sheol,* he said: *Clearly he is prophesying the descent of the Lord into Sheol, who redeems his soul with the others lest he remain there.*

Gregory of Nyssa in Oration 2 on the Pasch, near the end, said: *Do you want to know something about the time of the triduum? It suffices only to know that when the Lord, being omnipotent wisdom, was for such a short space of time in the heart of the earth, which is the domicile of that mind (of the devil), he was able to deceive and make a fool of that great mind which dwells in it.* And later he calls the subterranean places the heart of the earth, where the seat of the devil is.

Gregory Nazianzen in Oration 2 on the Pasch, near the end, said: *If he descends into Sheol, go down together with him, and also get to know the mysteries which Christ explained there, etc.* In the same place he poses a question, but does not answer it: whether Christ released everyone from the underworld, or only some.

Epiphanius in Ancor. before the middle, on page 340, said: *He is said to be free among the dead. "Free" means that the underworld did not have power over him, but that by his own will he descended into Sheol with his soul.* See also his Heresies 46, which deals with Tatian, where he says that Christ descended into Sheol in order to set free the soul of Adam, and the souls of the other Fathers. Chrysostom in homily 2 on the Creed, after he explained the burial, then adds: *He descended into the underworld, so that also there he might not be lacking in miracles.*

Cyril in the book on the right Faith to Theodotius, near the middle, said: *The soul having gained a union joined to the Word, descended indeed into the underworld by the divine power, and using his power, he appeared to the spirits who were there, and he said to those bound: Depart from here, and to those in the darkness, Come forth into the light.*

Likewise: *Just as the only-begotten, when in the flesh, associated with those who were still in the flesh, so also he preached to the souls in the underworld, having a soul united to himself in which he was.* See also book 12, chapter 36 on John.

Theodoretus on Ps. 16, concerning the words, *You will not leave my soul in Sheol,* says that Arius and Apollinaris are obviously refuted, since they say that Christ did not assume a soul. Damascene in book 3 on Faith, in the last chapter, said: *The deified soul descended into the underworld, and just as the sun rose on those who are in the land of justice, so also light shone on those who under the earth sat in the darkness and shadow of death.*

Now the Latin authors. Tertullian in chapter 54 of his book on the soul said: *For us the lower regions (of Hades) are not supposed to be a bare cavity, nor some subterranean sewer of the world, but a vast deep space in the interior of the earth, and a concealed recess in its very bowels; and we read that Christ in His death spent three days in the heart of the earth, that is, in the secret inner recess which is hidden in the earth, and enclosed by the earth, and superimposed on the abysmal depths which lie still lower down.* And in the same place: *If Christ descended into the lower parts of the earth, in order to make the patriarchs and prophets there partakers in himself, you must suppose Hades to be a subterranean region.*

Hippolytus the martyr, in the Oration on the Antichrist, at the beginning said: fife *believe in) his blessed passion on the cross, his burial, descent into the underworld, ascension, and the redemption of souls, etc.* Cyprian near the end of his Sermon on the anointing of Chrism said: *The king suffered to be mocked and to be killed, and descending into Hades he made a captive of the ancient captivity.* The following sermon has similar statements.

Hilary on Ps. 139:8 on the words, *If I make my bed in Sheol, you are there,* said: *This is a law of human necessity, that when bodies are buried, the souls descend into Sheol; and the Lord at the end of his life as a true man did not avoid this descent.* And in book 10 on the Trinity, near the middle: *Will it be said that the body, which lay in the sepulcher, descended into Hades?*

Philastrius in his book on heresies, in the chapter on the descent into Hades, says that those people are in error who think that, when Christ descended into Hades, he liberated the souls of the poets, and philosophers, and similar infidels, and then he added: *For if they had believed that God exists, they would not have invented the foul names of their gods and goddesses, and they would have obtained pardon in the descent of Christ into Hades.*

Gaudentius in tractate 6 on Exodus said: *In the night in which he left his lifeless body on the cross, the Son of God went with his soul to the lower Egypt in order to visit the souls confined in Hades, etc.*

Ambrose in book 3, chapter 3 on Faith said: *He is free, because he did not know the chains of death, not having been captured by the underworld. He did not need any assistance, because the Lord by himself saved his people and he did not need either a messenger or an ambassador.* See also on the mystery of the Pasch, chapter 4, and on Rom. 10, and on Eph. 4.

Jerome in his comments on Eph. 4 said: *Hades is understood as the lower parts of the earth, to which our Lord and Savior descended, in order, as victor, to bring with himself into heaven the souls of the Saints which were being held there.* He taught similar things very clearly in his comments on Sir. 3 and Zech. 9.

Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed has this to say: *But John also says: Are you he who is to come (doubtless into the underworld) or should we look for another?* And after that: *Therefore he returned as victor from the dead; bringing the spoils of the underworld with him, he led forth those who had been held by death.*

Augustine in letter 57 to Dardanus at question 1: *On that day the man Christ Jesus was not going to be in heaven, but in the underworld with his soul, and in the sepulcher with his body.* In letter 99: *Who, except an infidel, denied that Christ was in the underworld?* And lest we understand that the underworld means the sepulcher, he adds after that: *Scripture clearly says that he was in the underworld with his soul.* In tractate 78 on John: *Who was not left in the underworld? Christ Jesus, but in his soul only. Who was going to resurrect on the third day who lay in the sepulcher? Christ Jesus, but in the flesh only.* See also book 17, chapter 11 in *The City of God,* and book 21, chapter 15, and his comments on Ps. 86.

Leo in Sermon 1 on the Resurrection of the Lord said: *The Resurrection of the Savior caused a long delay neither of the soul in the underworld, nor of the body in the sepulcher.* Fulgentius in book 3, chapter 23 to Thrasimus: *The divinity did not forsake the body in death, just as it did not abandon the soul Hades.* And in chapter 35: *God knew that he was the receiver of a complete man—he would be totally with his body in burial, and totally with his soul in Hades.*

Vigilius martyr in book 2 against the Eutychians said: *On that day the body was not in paradise, nor in Hades, but it lay lifeless in the sepulcher; during the three days the soul was in Hades, not in the sepulcher.*

Gregory in book 13, chapter 20 of his book on Morality: *Since our creator and redeemer entered the confines of the underworld and led forth from there the souls of the elect, he did not allow us to go to that place from which he had liberated the others by going there.* See also chapter 21 and his explanation of the Psalm, *De profundis.* Bede in book 3 on Job 7 said: *I think that the Lord said this, that near the end of the world, for the redemption of man, he would descend into the underworld where he said he walked with the power of one descending, because it was impossible that, like one guilty of sin, he should be held by the infernal chains.*

Therefore we have the consensus of the Fathers, who flourished more than 800 years ago; certainly we would be very stupid if we did not prefer them to a few contemporary heretics.

CHAPTER XV

CHRIST PROPERLY AND REALLY DESCENDED INTO THE UNDERWORLD

The fourth error is that of Durandus in 3 Sent. d. 22, q. 3, where he teaches that the soul of Christ descended into the underworld, not according to its substance, but through certain effects, because indeed he did bless and illuminate the holy Fathers, who were in limbo. Such an idea about the going of Christ to the souls of the holy Fathers, by efficacy and not be essence, was taught by Calvin, as the distinction given above indicated.

But there is a big difference between the opinion of Calvin and that of Durandus. First, Calvin does not call it *a descent into the underworld,* but he imagines another descent through the sufferings of hell experienced by Christ; but Durandus says that Christ descended into the underworld. Second, Calvin denies a real underworld, and especially the limbo of the Fathers; Durandus in the same place acknowledges both places. Third, Calvin places the souls of the Saints in heaven, even before the coming of Christ; Durandus says they were in limbo. Fourth, Calvin denies that the souls of the Saints were beatified by Christ; Durandus says they were. Firth, Calvin says that his view is certain; but Durandus says that it should not be asserted obstinately that the soul of Christ did not descend according to his essence into the underworld, indeed perhaps that it did, but that it is not certain, since however it is certain that he did descend according to the effects.

Therefore, Durandus erred only on this point—that he thinks it must not be believed necessarily that the soul of Christ really was in the underworld according to its essence. Now it will be proved that this opinion is erroneous.

First, because the Scriptures, Councils and Fathers already cited clearly say that the soul of Christ descended into the underworld, and that his body remained in the sepulcher; and it is certain that his body truly and really, not figuratively, remained in the sepulcher actually, not by its effects.

Secondly, if Christ was in the underworld through his effects, not only the soul but also the body was in the underworld, because the cause of those effects was also the body. And Durandus does not give satisfaction when he responds that the principal cause was the soul. For, the principal cause was the composite, that is, the whole man who suffered and merited. Moreover, granted that the soul was the principal cause, still the flesh and blood were the cause, otherwise it would not be truly said in 1 John 1:7, *The blow of Jesus cleanses us.* Therefore, it could be said truly—the flesh and blood of Chris descended into the underworld, which is contrary to Scripture and the Fathers.

Thirdly, if he descended into the underworld only through his effects, then at thi same time the soul of Christ was in many places at the same time—in Hades, in th earthly paradise, on earth, in heaven; for without doubt the death of Christ had som effect in all these places, enlightening the souls of the Fathers in limbo, rejoicing th angels in heaven, consoling Enoch and Elijah in paradise, and on earth producin compunction in men. Therefore why in the Creed is there mention only of the descer into the underworld? Why do all the Fathers preach that Christ during the three days w

in the underworld, and do not say that he was in heaven or on earth, indeed why do some expressly deny it?

Fourthly, the soul of Christ for three days was in the heart of the earth, but that effect took place in a moment. Likewise, the soul of Christ returned on the third day, actually when he rose from the dead, for then he returned from the underworld to the upper regions; but according to his effects he never returned, because the effects remain always; or if he returned after accomplishing his mission, certainly he returned on the very same day he died, because immediately after his death the Lord dispelled the shadows of the underworld, and enlightened the Fathers with the divine vision. Therefore it seems that one of two things must be granted—either that the Lord never returned from the underworld, or he returned on that first day. But both of these contradict the Creed of Faith, the Scriptures and the confession of the Fathers.

Finally, from the fundamental position of Durandus it follows that Christ in no way descended into the underworld. It is his fundamental position, because souls cannot be in place except by their operation; and again, they cannot operate except in their own body, whose form they are. From this it follows that separated souls cannot be really and simply in place.

And because someone could say: the souls of the impious are not in hell, or the souls of the Saints were not in limbo, nor are they now in heaven. Durandus adds that formerly the souls were in limbo through deputation, because they had been deputed to that place, when they received bodies, unless Christ redeemed them; but that the souls of the impious are in hell through deputation simply, because they are where they are when they receive bodies.

But from this it follows that the souls of the Saints were not in the underworld, nor are they now in heaven, but that they were going to be in the underworld, and now are going to be in heaven; for to be in place through deputation, is not to be, but to be such in the future. As consuls designated for the following year were not said to be, and they were not Consuls, but they were only going to be Consuls. Hence it follows further that Christ in no way descended into the underworld, for he descended to the place of souls, but those souls were going to be in the underworld, but actually then they were nowhere. Therefore Christ never descended, because he did not go to the underworld.

Durandus objects in the first place. Souls are in a corporeal place only through the operation which they exercise in that place; but souls can operate nothing except in their own body, and through their body. Therefore since they are lacking a body, they are nowhere.

I respond first of all that the opinion of those is not improbable, who teach that both angels and souls are in place through their essence, which since it is a certain thing, and finite, necessarily is present in one certain place, and not in another, unless it moves from place to place.

Secondly, I say that according to St. Thomas souls cannot naturally be applied to a certain place except by operation; this opinion is expressly that of Nyssa in chapter 11 of his book on the Soul, nor can it operate outside its own body. However, supernaturally both are possible, as the same St. Thomas says in I, q. 117; and St. Augustine says the

same in chapter 16 of his book on the care of the dead. Therefore with the approval of God a separated soul can move bodies, and appear, and speak and act in the way in which the angels act, as is clear concerning the soul of Samuel in 1 Sam. 28:12, and the soul of Moses in Matt. 17:3, and the soul of St. Felix which, according to St. Augustine in the cited place, openly appeared to many; and there is the case of the soul of Paschasius, which St. Germanus saw in the warm baths at Puteoli helping others in that hot place, according to St. Gregory in book 4, chapter 40 of his Dialogues. And many similar events can be given which can in no way be denied.

The soul can also, with God's approval, produce nothing in bodies, and still be bound to a certain place, even though we do not understand how this takes place, as Augustine teaches in book 21, chapter 10 of *The City of God;* for we also do not understand perfectly how our soul, which is an immortal spirit, is united so intimately to the body, so that they become one thing, and still we all believe that.

The second objection of Durandus is this: the soul of Christ is said to have descended into the underworld, in order to make blessed the souls of the Saints. But the souls of the Saints were blessed in the very instant in which Christ died, and the soul of Christ could not in the same instant be in the underworld, because it would have to be in two places at the same time. Therefore, he did not descend by a true motion, but by a metaphorical one, that is, by the effect.

I respond that it is inappropriate to call into doubt the mysteries of the Faith because of these trivial arguments. For, first of all, from what source does Durandus draw the conclusion that souls necessarily had to be blessed in the exact same instant when Christ died? For, although then the price of our redemption was paid, and the souls of the righteous should soon be beatified, still that "soon" could be a certain amount of time which was required for the soul of Christ to be present to the souls of the Fathers. For although the presence of the soul of Christ was not necessary that the Fathers be enlightened by the divine vision, still it seems to be fitting that it be present, when that is done; and there was no danger lest those holy souls, who had waited patiently for many centuries, now would be upset at a delay in time that was very brief and almost imperceptible. Then, Christ did not descend into the underworld only for the sake of the beatification of souls, for he could have done it without descending, but he also did it to remain in the place of the souls for those three days, during which his body lay in the place for bodies, and he did it also for other reasons.

The third objection of Durandus is that during the three days the soul of Christ was with the thief in paradise, according to Luke 23:43, *Today you will be with mein paradise;* but he was not in paradise according to place, as is known, but according to the effect, because the blessed soul of Christ made blessed also the soul of the thief. Therefore for the same reason, since he is said to have been in the underworld at the same time, it should not be understood about the underworld as to a place, but as to the effect or if he was in the underworld, he was also in paradise as to the place; hence he was ir two places at the same time.

First, I respond that paradise is taken here metaphorically, but the underwork properly. For, the word "paradise" properly signifies an orchard or garden of fruit. Henc·

in Eccles. 2:5 Solomon says "I made myself gardens and parks," and in Hebrew it is œonD nm but the word "underworld" properly designates a lower place.

Secondly, since all the Fathers teach that the soul of Christ during the three days was in the underworld where the other souls were, and in fact the Scriptures and the Councils and the Creed say the same thing, it is not in any way to be denied by a Christian, either that the word "paradise" is taken metaphorically, which is veiy much in accord with reason, or also is taken properly; for, it was not impossible for God to bring it about that the soul of Christ was at the same time in two places.

Therefore, having completed the explanation given above, now by way of an appendix we will answer some questions which are wont to be considered by Catholics concerning the descent of Christ into the underworld.

CHAPTER XVI

SOME DOUBTS ARE RESOLVED

The first doubt. To which place in the underworld did he descend? St. Thomas in III, q. 32, a. 2 teaches through his real presence he descended only to the limbo of the Fathers, but by effect he descended to all the places in the underworld. For, he accused the damned of incredulity, but to those who were being cleansed he offered the hope of glory.

But it is really probable that the soul of Christ descended to all the places in the underworld. First, because of the text in Sir. 24:45: *I will enter into all the lower paris of the earth, I will look at all those sleeping.*

Secondly, because Augustine in letter 99 says that Christ descended into the places of the underworld, where there were sorrows and torments. And Fulgentius in book 3, chapter 30 in the work for Thrasimundus says that Christ descended all the way to hell, where the souls of sinners are tormented. Cyril of Jerusalem in #4 of his Catechism, Ambrose in his book on the Mystery of the Pasch, Eusebius Emissenus in his Oration on the Pasch, and other Fathers, when they describe the horrors of hell and the demons, in the descent of Christ they say clearly that Christ manifested his presence to them. Indeed, Nyssa in Oration 1 on the Resurrection clearly says that the heart of the earth, to which Christ descended, is the seat of that clever mind, which is said to be that of the devil.

Additionally, the other Cyril in book 12, chapter 36 on John, and other Fathers, say that Christ descended to the lower parts of the earth that he might take dominion over the living and the dead, that is, to gain possession as it were of his whole kingdom; for. the damned also belong to his kingdom, since they are the ones subject to prison and torments at his command.

However, the opinion of St. Thomas is more probable and it is also that of other authors in comments on 3 Sent., dist. 22. For, the testimonies of Ecclesiasticus and of the holy Fathers can be understood to be about his presence made known to all the places from limbo itself. For, if the rich Feaster from the hell of the damned could see Lazarus resting in the bosom of Abraham, and also speak with Abraham, Christ could much more easily see all the parts of the underworld from limbo, and be seen by all the spirits, and indeed reject some and console others.

The second doubt is whether Christ suffered any pain in hell. St. Thomas in III, q. 52, a. 1 and 3, seems to say that there was some pain in Christ by being in hell according to his soul and in the sepulcher according to his body. For he says that he wanted to be therein order to receive in himself our sufferings. Cajetan in his comments on Acts 2 says that the sorrows of death continued in Christ until the resurrection by reason of the penalties that remain from death, and they are mainly three. First, that the soul remains separated, which would be better off joined. Second, that the soul remains in a place not suitable for it, that is, in the underworld. Third, that the body remains in the sepulcher, and he says that this is indicated by the words of Peter, *Having loosed the pangs of death* (Acts 2:24).

But Bonaventure on 3 Sent., d. 22, q. 4, says that the soul of Christ, while he was in heli was in a place of pain but without pain, and his way of speaking seems to me to be moreii

conformity with the Fathers. Therefore, although the soul remains separated from the body, pain or ρυηΐδΰυηβηζ could be said to be a state of less perfection; however, I would not dare to call the presence of the soul of Christ in hell, and of the body in the sepulcher a type of suffering or punishment; for, those souls suffer in hell, who are there as in a prison and they cannot leave it whenever they wish; but Christ was in the underworld as a free person and as the liberator of others, as all the Fathers say. But it is not called a punishment, if a king visits prisons in order to free some, but it is called dignity and humility. Similarly, to be in a sepulcher is not a punishment, nor simply an evil for the body, in fact it is good for a dead body; but it is an evil to be corrupted in a sepulcher, and to become rotten. However, the body of Christ was in the sepulcher, but without corruption.

Hence Fulgentius in book 3, chapter 30 in his work for Thrasimundus says that for the full effect of the redemption Christ had to descend with his soul to the place of torments, but not to suffer any torments, and with his body to the place of corruption, but not to suffer corruption, just as he had received a human nature similar to our sinful nature, but he received it without sin. And the reason of Cajetan from the sermon of Peter in Acts 2:24, *Having loosed the pangs of death,* does not prove anything. For, as we showed above against Calvin, the sorrows of death are said to be those that precede and accompany death, not those that follow.

But Cajetan objects that the expression, *You will not abandon my soul in Sheol,* signifies a benefit for the soul of Christ, because he was freed from that place; therefore it was a punishment for him to remain there.

I respond that it was a benefit for the soul of Christ that it was quickly joined together with his body, just as the separation for him was an evil; and in this way the liberation from hell was a benefit for him, not by reason of the place, but by reason of the separation from the body. And perhaps this is what St. Thomas wanted to say, namely, that it was a punishment for Christ to be in the underworld and in the sepulcher, only by reason of the separation; for, his reason proves nothing else but this, namely, that he had to suffer our punishment.

For, this reason, if it is adduced to prove that Christ truly had to die, and therefore to suffer the separation of the soul from the body, concludes correctly. But if from that someone wishes to prove that Christ had to be in hell as in a miserable place of suffering, it will prove nothing, or it will prove more than we want. For, according to that way of reasoning, the soul of Christ should have been in hell as in a prison, and his body should have corrupted in the sepulcher, because that is our punishment.

The third doubt: What does the descent of Christ into the underworld confer on the souls of the righteous? St. Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius seems to think that those souls even previously were blessed, and that the descent of Christ conferred nothing on them. So he said: *As to those righteous, who were in the bosom of Abraham, when he (Christ) descended into the underworld, I found that he had not yet conferred anything on them; and I see that he never departed from them according to the beatifying presence of his divinity.*

I respond with the common view of Catholics that Christ conferred two laige gifts. First, essential beatitude. Second, release from that prison, and entrance into heaven; the first of these he gave to them immediately, and the second one not long afterwards.

Concerning the first we have the testimony of Ecclesiasticus 24:45: *I will enter into all the lowerparts of the earth, I will enlighten all those who hope in the Lord.* Also Luke 23:43: *Today you will be with me in paradise.* This word, Origen said in homily 15 on Genesis, was spoken not only to the thief, but also to all the righteous who were in the underworld. Likewise there is the consensus of the Scholastics in their comments on 3 Sent., d. 22. Finally, we will show in book 1 on the cult of the Saints, with a proper demonstration, that after the passion of Christ the souls of the Saints are admitted immediately to the vision of God. On the second benefit we have the consensus of the Fathers cited above.

St. Thomas, in III, q. 52, a. 5 ad 1, responds to the opinion of Augustine that Augustine did not want to say that he did not find what Christ conferred on the righteous by his descent into the underworld, absolutely, but with regard to the sorrows of the underworld, which he removed, so that the meaning is: Christ descended in order to remove the sorrows of the underworld; but the righteous were not sorrowing; therefore with regard to removing sorrows, he conferred nothing on them.

Perhaps we will say better that Augustine, when he wrote that letter, did not yet know where the bosom of Abraham was, and also was inclined to put it in a place so that it was not in hell, and because of that, while this doubt was remaining, he rightly said that he could not yet understand what the descent of Christ into the underworld conferred on the righteous. For, as we have said, Christ conferred two benefits on the souls of the righteous—the beatific vision and release from the prison of the underworld. Because of the first, there was no need for the descent, since the divinity is that which really beatifies, and it is everywhere. And this is what he says there when he states that the beatifying wisdom in his divinity was never absent from the souls of those justified persons; for, he does not want to say that those souls were always blessed, but that there was no need for the movement of Christ that they be made blessed, since the beatifying wisdom is everywhere. Because of the second benefit, there was no need for the descent of Christ into the underworld, if those souls were not in hell.

The fourth doubt is: Whether, besides the souls of the justified, which were in the bosom of Abraham, some others were liberated? I respond that no souls of the damned in hell were liberated. For, Philastrius in his book on the heresies, in the chapter on the descent into the underworld, and Augustine in chapter 79 in his book on heresies say that it is a heresy if anyone should say any of the impious in hell were converted and saved by the preaching of Christ. Moreover, it seems to imply a contradiction to say that some were damned to eternal punishments, and nevertheless afterwards were saved. For, eternal damnation includes the certitude of punishment that will never end; but how could they be certain that they would be punished without end, who then at some time are liberated?

Add to this the text in Ecclesiasticus 24:45: *I will enlighten all those who hope in the Lord.* For from this it is concluded that none of those were illuminated, who were condemned to eternal punishments, because without doubt they did not hope in the Lord. Add also the verse in John 9:4: *Night comes, when no one can work.* And 2 Cor. 5:10: *must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one many receive who! he has done in the body.* And Gal. 6:8: *He who sows to his own flesh will from the flesh reap corruption... while we have the time let us do good.* Now all of these texts indicate

sufficiently that after this life there is no place for repentance or reconciliation. In addition, finally, there is the consensus of theologians regarding 3 Sent., d. 22.

Wherefore among the fables the stoiy should be mentioned, which was circulated in the history of the Fathers concerning what Nicetas says in his commentary on Oration 2 on the Pasch of Gregory Nazianzen. For, he reports that to a certain Christian, who was researching the memory of Plato as impious and condemned, Plato appeared quietly and said: *I surely do not deny that I was a sinner, but -when Christ descended into hell, no one embraced the Faith before me.* But this is a fable. However, what Nicetas says in the same place should be believed, namely, that Chrysostom declared that none of those in hell were liberated when Christ descended to that place, except those who were worthy of salvation.

The same reason applies to the souls of infants, who died with original sin; for it is not credible that any of those were saved. Accordingly, what Clement of Alexandria says in book 6 of the Stromata, namely, that at the preaching of Christ in the underworld there were some who believed and repented, is improbable.

There can be more doubt about the souls in purgatory. For, it seems to be concluded from Ecclesiasticus 24:45, *I will enlighten all those who hope in the Lord,* that then all pious souls were beatified. Moreover, Augustine in letter 99 to Evodius and in book 12, chapter 33 on Genesis clearly says that some were freed from the pains of the underworld by Christ, and he explains that he is not talking about the holy souls in the bosom of Abraham, nor about the souls of the damned, whose conversion at the preaching of Christ he considered to be absurd; therefore it follows that he is talking about the souls which were still suffering the pains of purgatory. Likewise, Gregory in book 13, chapter 20 in his book on Morality says that all the saved were liberated.

However, St. Thomas in III, q. 52, a. 8 teaches that the souls in purgatoiy were not simply freed because of the descent of Christ into the underworld; for Christ did not confer something on anyone, except what he merited by his passion; but the passion of Christ did not have a temporal effect, but it did have an eternal effect, for it is always equally efficacious. Therefore, at that time Christ would not have liberated any except those who had a disposition such as those have who are liberated now. But St. Thomas does add that it could have happened in two ways that at that time some were liberated. First, if they had completed the time of their purgation. Second, if from a special devotion for the passion of Christ they merited in this life that they then would be liberated when Christ descended to that place. And the view of St. Augustine should be explained in this way, since he says that those were liberated whom the Lord knew should be liberated.

To the quotes from Ecclesiasticus and Gregoiy it could be said that Christ freed all the elect, when he descended into the underworld, but not all at once. For, he freed some immediately, and others later, when they finished their purgation. However, he did grant to all that they would not remain in limbo waiting for their beatitude. Although it would not be an error, if someone should say that many others, or also all of them were then freed from purgatoiy, because of a special grace, because the Lord is not limited by the Sacraments, or by our merits.

BOOK FIVE

On the office and merit of the mediator

CHAPTER I

IT IS EXPLAINED BRIEFLY ACCORDING TO WHICH NATURE CHRIST IS MEDIATOR

Two questions about Christ remain to be treated: one, according to which nature Christ is the Mediator; the other, whether Christ the Mediator by his works and labors merited something only for us, or also for himself. We have dedicated this last book, or rather bookleζ to the answering of these questions.

Therefore, in order to begin at the beginning, it is necessary to explain the real meaning of a mediator. We call a mediator someone who places himself in the middle between people who are in disagreement, or certainly are not united, in order to bring them to harmony, or to bring them together to a new agreement; this can take place in two ways. First, by some kind of substantial mediation; second, by operation.

In the first way Christ can be said to be a mediator, inasmuch as his personality joins together the divine and human natures in a new and wondrous covenant. And although the Fathers often speak about this mediation, still that is not the one we are now going to consider; for, concerning that mediation it is not necessary to ask according to which nature it takes place. For it does not take place according to a nature, but according to the personality which joins together the two natures. Moreover, that mediation is not between opposed natures, because the humanity of Christ was never opposed to the divinity. But we are speaking about the mediation whereby the innocent Christ reconciled sinners with the Father.

Therefore, having omitted this substantial mediation, the mediation which consists in works can take place in four ways.

First, by discerning and judging the reason why arbitrators can be said to be mediators. And this first way is attributed to Christ by Ambrose in his comments on 1 Tim. 2:5. For, Ambrose says that Christ, having been made the arbitrator by God, judged that peace could be obtained, if God first were to forgive, and then man would remain in the Faith of God.

Secondly, by arranging agreements between both sides, and conditions agreed to by both parties, so that all the go-betweens can be said to be mediators. And the name of Mediator seems to be taken in this signification, since Moses says in Deut. 5:5: *I stood between the Lord and you at that time.* And Gal. 3:19-20: *It was ordained by angels through an intermediary,* that is, Moses. And this way also fits Christ, who announced to men the will of God and his laws; and because of that he is called in Mal. 3:1: & *messenger of the covenant.* And in Heb. 9:15 and 12:24: *The mediator of a new covenant.*

There Paul is alluding to the Moses, who was the mediator of the Old Testament.

Thirdly, by praying to and beseeching one party for the other. This also fits Christ, who in Rom. 8:34 is said *to intercede for us.* And in 1 John 2:1 he is said to be *our Advocate.*

Fourthly, by paying and making satisfaction to one party for the other; and this way of mediation really is suitable for Christ, who in the Scriptures is described as a victim for sin. Therefore, in 1 Tim. 2:5, after the Apostle had said, *There is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus,* immediately he gave the reason, saying: *Who gave himself as a ransom for all.* And therefore also in Rom. 8:34 and 1 John 2:1, where Christ is said to be the advocate and intercessor before God for us, he is not said to be the one advocate or intercessor, because others also intercede for us; nor was he the only mediator by way of arbitration and intercession, but there was also Moses; but only he paid the price for us, and reconciled us with God by his own blood.

Therefore, the first three ways of mediation are common to Christ and to others, but the fourth way belongs properly to Christ alone. But in this place our question can be understood to be about all the ways whereby we investigate according to which nature the office of mediator is suitable for Christ.

However, it is the common opinion of Catholics that the mediator himself, or (as theologians say) the principle which produces the works of the mediator, was not God alone, or man alone, but both together, that is, the incarnate Word, or the humanized God. But the principle by which those works were done by the mediator were the human nature, not the divine nature. For, although it was the incarnate God who prayed, suffered, obeyed, made satisfaction, he did all these things in the form of a servant, not in the form of God. And this is the opinion of the Master in 3 Sent., d. 19 near the end, and of St. Bonaventure in article 2 on the same place, and of other theologians in their comments on the same distinction, and also of St. Thomas in III, q. 26, a. 2.

Opposed to this opinion at the present time are two connected errors; one is based on Nestorianism and the other on Eutychianism. With the help of God we will now refute both of them with a few proofs.

CHAPTER II

THE ERROR OF STANCARUS ON THE MEDIATOR IS REFUTED

The first error is that of Francis Stancarus, who attributes the office of mediator to the man Christ alone in such a way that he does not seem to require the divine suppositum in any way, or at least to require it as the efficient cause of the work. Indeed Francis Stancarus in many places seems to be thinking correctly: for, in his book on the Trinity and the Mediator against Tigurinus, and in his other book of arguments against Calvin, and in his examination of the Pinczovianists, and in another book on the office of Mediator, and in his booklet on the word "Tantum," he repeats often that the person of Christ is composed out of two natures, divine and human; and in his book against Tigurinus, near the end, he professes that he follows the doctrine of the Master of the Sentences, and of the Scholastics, and he speaks about the Master so honorably that he places him before all other authors: *One Peter Lombard,* he said, *has more value than a hundred Luthers, two hundred Melachthons, three hundred Bullingers, four hundred Peter Martyrs, and five hundred Calvins; all of these, if they were crushed together in a mortar, would not produce one ounce of true Theology.* However, suspect words and things that do not sound quite right are to be found in his books.

For, in his book on the Trinity and the Mediator, in refutation of the prior letter of Tigurinus, he says that the dignity of the prayers of Christ did not come from the Son alone, but from the whole Trinity thus ordaining and accepting it. Here he seems quite clearly not to attribute infinite dignity to the works of Christ coming from the dignity of the suppositum, but from the divine acceptance. Certainly he would not have done this, if he thought that the works of the mediator were not the works of a human suppositum, but of a divine one. And in the same book, in refutation 2, he says that in Christ the human nature is the mediator, the conciliator, the pacifier. There he seems to attribute the whole work to the nature itself, as if it existed by itself, and acted by itself, especially since in the same book previously he had said that one work could not be attributed to the person of the mediator.

And in his book on the office of Mediator and Pontiff he says this: *The man Christ is priest and sacrifice, not Christ as God, that is, Christ according as he is man, not according as he is God.* These words can be given a good meaning, however, simply stated they do not sound well. And this is especially so because a little later, when explaining them, he says that in the man Christ there are three things—Spirit, Soul and Body; and by reason of the Spirit Christ is a priest, by reason of the soul and body he is a victim. And there he never makes any mention of the operating divine suppositum. Finally, in the examination of the Pinczoviansts he said: *The word "Mediator" is taken first of all for the humanity of Christ performing the office of mediator; but secondly it is taken for the person of Christ himself, who is God and man.*

One can add to this that Frederic Staphylus in his book on the succession and concord of the disciples of Luther, and Gulielmus Lindanus in dialogue 2 for the Doubter, say that the Stancarians teach that Christ is the justifier only according to his humanity, because,

as they think, we are formally justified by the righteousness of Christ, or his obedience which is imputed to us. However, they say that his obedience and righteousness are the work of his humanity alone.

Finally, Peter Canisius, in book 1 on the corruption of the word of God, writes that the Stancarians were asked: why they think the two natures in Christ were united. And they were wont to respond—so that the human nature, sustained by the divine power, could suffer everything that had to be suffered.

This opinion, whether it is that of Stancarus or not (for I do not dare to say, since about this I am not absolutely certain), clearly reflects Nestorianism. For, verbally it professes one person in Christ, but in reality it places two persons, and so fully makes void the mystery of redemption. For, if the human nature alone existed, and therefore the suppositum was distinct from the divine suppositum (for it is the suppositum that acts), then there were in Christ two supposita, which is the very heresy of Nestorius.

Furthermore, this opinion is opposed to Scripture and the Fathers. For, the principal work of the mediator was the passion of Christ; but in the Scriptures this is attributed to God himself and the Lord; therefore it is necessary that it be agreeable to him, at least by reason of the suppositum. For is not God said in Acts 20:28 to have acquired the Church with his own blood? And in 1 Cor. 2:8 is not the Lord of glory said to have been crucified? And in Phil. 2:6 is not he who was in the form of God said to be equal to the Father, to be humiliated, and made obedient unto death, even death on a cross?

Moreover, the Fathers, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylact, Oecumenius, and others, comment on 1 Tim. 2:5. Likewise Hilary in book 9 on the Trinity, near the beginning; Epiphanius in Ancor., before the middle; Cyril in book 12, chapter 10 on the Theses and in book 1 on the Trinity, before the middle, Augustine in book 9, chapter 17 of *The City of God,* and Fulgentius in chapter 2 of the book on Faith for Peter say that Christ is therefore called the only mediator by Paul, because he alone is truly the medium between God and man, since he possesses the nature of both. There the Fathers want to show that Christ could not be an efficacious mediator, unless he were a divine person, who exercises the office of mediator. But he could not be a divine person, unless he had a divine nature; therefore they say that the unique and true mediator must be both God and man.

Besides these places there are also other very clear ones. Basil on this in Ps. 49:7: *A brother does not redeem, a man redeems: If a man,* he said, *cannot redeem ns, the one who redeems us is not a man. Therefore because of this that he comes to us in the similitude of the flesh of sin, you should not think that our Lord is only a man, etc.* Nazianzen in Oration 2 on the Pasch, near the end, said: *It was necessary for us that God assume flesh, and suffer death, so that we might live.*

Cyril in his book on the right faith to Regina: *Explicitly,* he said, *the death of Christ is salutary, but if he were not God, how could he alone be sufficient for paying the price? But only by dying does he suffice for all, because he is above all.*

Augustine in chapter 12 of his homily on the sheep said: *Man is not the mediator without the divinity, and God is not the mediator without the humanity. Behold the mediator, the divinity without humanity is not the mediatrix, but between the divinity*

alone and the humanity alone, the mediatrix is the human divinity and the divine humanity of Christ. There surely Augustine is speaking improperly, when he uses an abstract noun for the concrete, but he does express plainly what we want to say, namely, that he is not a mere man who exercised the office of mediator. And in chapter 108 of the Enchiridion he said: *We would not be liberated by that one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, unless he were also God.* Leo in Sermon 1 on the Nativity of the Lord said: *Unless he were true God, he would not have brought a remedy; unless he were a true man, he would not have given us an example.*

Finally, if a human person satisfied for us, he made satisfaction not out of strict justice, and so it was not a necessary incarnation. And the reasons of Stancarus do not prove anything against us, but they do against the Calvinists. His principal reason is that in the letter of Agatho, which was read at the fourth session of the Sixth Council, a personal work is denied, and a natural work in Christ is asserted, that is, the works of Christ are attributed to the natures, not to the person. But the answer to that is easy. For, Agatho does not want to deny that the works of Christ are the works of the person, and of one and the same person, but he wants to say that there is not just one work in Christ, according to the one person of the operator, but that there are two works according to the two natures, through which the one person operates. For, works are multiplied depending on the multiplication of the formal principal. As also in the Trinity there are three who operate, and nevertheless their work is only one, because there is one formal principle, namely, the one nature.

CHAPTER III

THE ERRORS OF THE CALVINISTS AND LUTHERANS CONCERNING THE MEDIATOR ARE REFUTED FROM THE SCRIPTURES

Another error contrary to the first one is that of those who say that Christ exercised the office of mediator according to both natures, the divine and the human. Calvin teaches this openly in the two letters to the Poles. The same thing is also taught by Tigurinus, Henry Bullingerus, Peter Martyr, and others also in the two letter to the Poles. Josias Simlerus teaches the same thing in his book against Stancarus, where he defends the letters of the Tigurinists which had been attacked by Stancarus. Martin Kemnitius also thinks the same way, because in his book on the two natures he includes among the absurd opinions that Christ is the mediator according to his human nature only. Melanchthom says the same thing in his chapter on the Son, where he says that the Divinity of the Son obeyed the Father. The book of the Concordia has the same thing on pages 556,645 and 736.

And lest they be thought to say that Christ is the mediator according to both natures by reason of the suppositum, but not by reason of the formal principal, it should be noted that it can be gathered clearly from two things what their real opinion is.

First, because they confess that they disagree in this matter with the Master and with the Scholastics. But the Master and the Scholastics in clear words teach that Christ is the mediator according to his human nature, not according to the divine, although he himself is the mediator, and must be both God and man.

Secondly, it is gathered from the fact that they distinguish the works of the Mediator, and some of them they want to be of the humanity as to the matter, but of the divinity as to the efficacy, as to suffer and to die. They want certain things to be of the divinity alone, as to enlighten minds, to forgive sins, etc., indeed they also attribute to the divine nature to offer sacrifice, but they say the victim is of the human nature. For, Stancarus says in his book on the Trinity and the Mediator that Stanislaus Sarnicius, whom Calvin calls a faithful servant of Christ in the letter to the Poles, in a public conference was ordered to write this: *The divine nature is the pontiff and priest, but the human nature is the sacrifice.* This error clearly introduces in one way Arianism, and in another way Eutychianism.

Therefore what has to be proved is that according to the human nature alone Christ is the mediator, if we are talking (as we have said) about the formal principal, not about the suppositum itself. And first of all we have from Scripture this text of St. Paul in 1 Tim. 2:5: *For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* Why, I ask, did he add the word "man," unless it is to express the nature according to which Christ is the mediator? Augustine pointed this out in book 1, chapter 28 of his treatise on original sin, and in Sermon 11 on the words of the Apostle.

Moreover, here the Apostle distinguishes the mediator from God: *There is one God,* he said, *and there is one mediator of God and men;* therefore Christ is not the mediator according to the divine nature, but only according to the human, according to which Christ is distinguished from God.

But the adversaries respond that here a distinction is made by reason of the person; for, by one God is understood the Father, from whom the Son is distinguished personally. Otherwise, they say, it would follow that there is a Quaternary, if the mediator were distinguished from the whole Trinity. Hence Calvin, in the second letter to the Poles, ridicules these explanations: *One God,* that is, *the Trinity;* and, *Believe in God,* that is, *in the Trinity.* And really in this way Calvin and the Calvinists strongly assert their Arianism; for, this is what the Arians say, namely, that wherever "one God" is read, or simply "God," the Father is understood, not the Trinity.

Furthermore, Chiysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact say, regarding this text, that by the "one" the Son is not excluded, but the gods of the Gentiles; therefore by "one God" they understood not the Father, but the Trinity. Likewise Augustine, in his Exposition on Psalm 29, while explaining these words says that the One God signifies the Trinity, and that Christ is the mediator between the Trinity and sinful men; for, he says this: *What does it mean to be the mediator between God and men? Not between the Father and men, but between God and men. What is God? Father, and Son and Holy Spirit. Who are the men? Sinners, impious, mortal. Between that Trinity, and the infirmity and injustice of men, the Mediator became a man, not hostile, but infirm.* He repeats the same thing in his Commentary on Gal. 3. The followers of Augustine teach the same things—Bede and Anselm in their Commentaries on 1 Tim. 2:5.

And reason itself also clearly bears witness to this. For, not only was the Father hostile to us because of our sins, and therefore had to be placated by a mediator, but also the Son and the Holy Spirit; therefore the whole Trinity had to be reconciled with men by a Mediator. Hence, when Paul says: *There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men,* by that "one God" it is necessaiy that the whole Trinity is meant. Therefore Calvin, when he rejects this explanation, is rejecting Augustine, Bede, Anselm and all the Greek Fathers, and reason itself. And because of that a Quaternary does not follow, because the same Christ because of the two natures is both numbered among the persons of the Trinity, to which reparation must be made, and at the same time it is he who makes the satisfaction. For he himself, as man, is mediator to himself as he is God.

CHAPTER IV

THE SAME ERROR IS REFUTED FROM THE FATHERS

Now the testimonies of the Fathers will be considered. First of all Cyril, in the Apology for the 12 chapters against the Orientals, proposes this objection against chapter 10: *If God the Word is a priest, to 'which God does he offer his service?* Then he replies in this way: *When he became man, he was called a High Priest, not because he offered sacrifice to a greater God, but to himself and to the Father.* And after that he says: *Hearing that he is called a priest because of his humanity, are you ashamed? Then why have you not been astonished, that because of the custom of priests he offered the sacrifice not to another, but rather to himself and to the Father, as he said?*

There Cyril not only says openly that Christ is the High Priest because of his humanity, but he also forces us to understand the negative, that is, not because of his divinity, since he says that the sacrifice was offered to himself and to the Father. For, one and the same person, as the same, cannot offer and receive sacrifice; but he did receive the sacrifice as God; therefore he does not offer it as God, so he offers it only as man. He says the same thing in book 11 on John 7: *Inasmuch as the Son is also God, he bestows benefits on us together with the Father; but inasmuch as he is mediator and high priest, he brings our prayers to the Father.*

Chiysostom when explaining Heb. 9:15, *Therefore he is the mediator of a new covenant, etc.,* said this: *What is a mediator? A mediator is not the Lord of the matter of which he is the mediator, but of some other matter.* But who says that Christ as God is not the Lord? Therefore Chrysostom says that Christ is mediator only according to the form of a servant.

The gloss of Josias Simlerus is absurd; for, he says that the divinity of Christ is a plain ruler, but by reason of the emptying it is no longer a ruler. But the emptying is not suitable for the divine nature, but for the person of the Son, who is said to be emptied, because he assumed the form of a servant, however not having lost the form of God. But to say that the divinity of the Son is not a ruler, is to say that there is no true divinity, but only a created nature, and that is what the Arians say.

Augustine in book 10, chapter 43 of his Confessions said: *As man, he is Mediator; but as Word, he is not something in between, for he is equal to God, God with God, and together with the Holy Spirit one God.* Likewise in letter 59 to Paulinus: *By Mediator,* he said, *not God, which the Word always was, but the man Christ Jesus.* And in book 1, chapter 7 on the Trinity he said: *Christ is the form of God is equal to the Father, in the form of a servant he is the mediator between God and men.* In book 1, chapter 3 on the Harmony of the Gospels he said: *As a man Christ was made both king and priest, so that, to intercede for us, he might be mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* In book 10, chapter 20 of *The City of God* he said: *Hence that true mediator, since he assumed the form of a servant, was made the mediator between God and men. In the form of God he receives the sacrifice with the Father, with whom he is also one God, but in the form of a servant he chose to be a sacrifice.* In book 16, chapter 15 against Faustus:

Christ, because he is God, is not similar to a man, but he is similar to man because as man he is mediator between God and men. In book 2 chapter 28 on original sin he said: *He is, however, not a Mediator, because He is equal with the Father; for in this respect He is Himself as far distant from us as the Father; and how can there be any medium where the distance is the very same? Therefore the apostle does not say, There is one Mediator between God and men, even Jesus Christ; but his words are, The Man Christ Jesus. He is the Mediator, then, in that He is man—inferior to the Father, by so much as He is nearer to ourselves, and superior to us, by so much as He is nearer to the Father. This is more openly expressed thus: He is inferior to the Father, because in the form of a servant; superior to us, because without spot of sin.* Likewise on Psalm 29: *Between the Trinity, and the infirmity and injustice of men, the Mediator became a man, not hostile, but infirm.*

Finally, (as we have testimonies from all ten volumes of Augustine) in tractate 82 on John he said: *Mediator between God and men, not as God but as man is Jesus Christ.* And in Sermon 11 on the words of the Apostle: *There is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men. He does not say,* he said, *Christ Jesus, lest you think it is said as the Word, but he added—man is the mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.* Fulgentius in chapter 13 of the book on the Incarnation and Grace said: He *became mediator between God and men in his human nature.*

CHAPTER V

THE SAME ERROR IS REFUTED WITH REASONS

Finally on this point there être some convincing reasons. The first reason is from the definition and conditions of a mediator. The mediator should be in the middle, that is, he stands at a distance in some way from both opposed parties; for if he is completely identified with one party, it cannot be thought, in fact it cannot even be imagined how he might be a mediator. Now this definition is suitable for Christ as he is a just man, but not as he is God; for, as man he is distant from God, but as just he is agreeable to God; and on the contrary, as man he agrees with other men, as just he is at a distance from all men. For, all are born by nature as children of wrath; but Christ as God is not distant from God in any way; therefore not as God, but as a just man he is the mediator between God and sinful men. And this is what Augustine says—between the Trinity and the infirmity and iniquity of men the mediator is a man, not a wicked one but an infirm one (as he said regarding Ps. 29).

The second reason. If Christ is the mediator according to both natures, it is either according to both taken together, or both together taken separately; it is not according to both taken together. For, Christ, according to both natures taken together, is distant indeed from other men, and also from God the Father and the Holy Spirit, but he is not distant from the Son, neither in person nor in nature. Nevertheless, he should be distant also from the Son, for he is the offended party, for whose placation there is need of a mediator.

The response to this by Josias is not valid, when he says that Christ as God is the mediator for himself. For, surely Christ as man is mediator for himself as he is God; but the one and same as he is God, to be mediator for himself as God, involves an obvious contradiction; for it would follow therefrom that Christ is distant from himself, and that he is not distant, considered for the same reason and manner. Therefore Christ, according to both natures taken together, cannot be the mediator. But that Christ is not the mediator according to both natures taken separately is clear, because it is not according to the divine nature taken separately, since that is the offended party, and according to that Christ is not distant from God; it remains, therefore, that he is mediator only according to the human nature.

The third reason. If Christ were in some way mediator according to the divine nature, all three persons would be mediators; for since the divine nature is common to the three, whatever according to that belongs to one person, belongs also to all three. Hence there is the maxim of the holy Fathers: *The works of the Trinity are undivided.* Then, that it is absurd, that all three persons are said to be mediators, seems not to need any proof; for, if the whole Trinity is mediator, for whom, I ask, will it be mediator? Is there some other God above the Trinity, for whom the Trinity itself performs the office of mediator?

Josias responds that the works of the Trinity are undivided in such a way that often they are attributed to others, as proper to them. And he offers two examples of this. One is in the internal acts, for the Father alone begets, the Son alone is begotten, although the

works of the Trinity are undivided. The second is in external acts, for in the baptism of Christ in Matt. 3:17 the Father alone said: *This is my beloved Son;* and only the Spirit in the form of a dove appeared. And something similar is read in Matt. 17:5 concerning the voice from the cloud at the Transfiguration, and this is confirmed by the testimonies of Augustine in Sermon 11 on the word of the Lord and of Leo in his sermon on the Transfiguration and in Sermons 2 and 3 on Pentecost.

But these examples are very weak. For, to beget and to be begotten in God are not essential actions, which are common to the three persons, but they are called notional acts, which do not put anything proper in the persons besides a relation. For, to beget is divine understanding with a relation of the one producing the notion; and indeed to understand itself is common to the three, only the relation is proper to the one begetting. But the actions of a mediator are outward actions; if they are suitable to Christ as he is God, they are suitable to all the other persons, who are the same God with Christ.

The second example also does not prove anything. For, in the baptism of Christ the voice which was heard was formed by the whole Trinity, but in order to signify only the Father. As also the dove was formed by the whole Trinity, but in order to represent only the Holy Spirit. Thus a true and real action done by them was common; but only the representation is proper to one. The cited Fathers teach this, and Augustine teaches it clearly in book 2, chapter 10 on the Trinity: *The person of the Father,* he said, *is shown also in that voice, where the dove descends on the one baptized, not because the voice could happen without the work of the Son and the Holy Spirit, since the Trinity operates inseparably; but because that voice happened to manifest the person of the Father alone.* Therefore, since we do not dispute what the works of the mediator signify, but by whom they are done, Josias should concede that the actions of the mediator are common to the whole Trinity. Therefore, according to Josias it will be permitted to say—the Father intercedes for us, he pours out his blood for us, and other similar things, which obviously pertain to the heresy of the Patripassionists.

The fourth reason. The proper office of a mediator is to sacrifice, and by sacrificing to make satisfaction, as is certain from Heb. 7, 8 and 9, and from the admission of the adversaries. But to sacrifice cannot pertain to Christ according to his divinity, but only according to the humanity, since to make the divinity of the Son a priest is plain Arianism; for, every priest is less than he whose priest he is; for, his office is to serve. Accordingly, Ambrose said in book 3, chapter 5 on Faith: *There is the same priest and the same victim, but priesthood and sacrifice are the duty of the human condition.* And after that: *Therefore no one, where he sees the order of the human condition, says that the divinity is there.*

Jerome on Psalm 110 concerning the words: *The Lord has sworn... You are priest for ever: He did not swear to him,* he said, *who was begotten before Lucifer, but to him who was born of the Virgin after Lucifer.* Fulgentius in chapter 2 on the Faith for Peter *The priest alone,* he said, *the sacrifice and the temple, and all these things God did according to the form of a servant.* Augustine in book 1, chapter 3 on the Harmony of the Gospels: *As a man,* he said, *Christ was made king and high priest.* Finally, in the Sermon on Arianism on proposition 33, found in volume 6 of Augustine's works, he says that

the Son is the minister and priest of the Father; therefore Christ did not sacrifice as God, except in the opinion of the Arians.

The same thing can be said about the other offices of Christ the mediator, such as that he intercedes for us (Rom. 8:34), that he is our advocate (in 1 John 2:1), that he gave himself as a ransom for us, in 1 Tim. 2:6. All of these things prove an inferior nature; therefore, Christ as God cannot be a mediator, unless as God he is less that the Father, and serves the Father as a minister.

The fifth reason. If the proper operation of a mediator pertains to Christ by reason of both natures, a confusion of the operations is the result, and consequently a confusion of the natures in Christ, which is the heresy of the Monothelites and the Eutychians, which was condemned at the 17th session of the Sixth Council. For, since in the Sixth Council one operation in Christ is rejected, the one operation is not rejected with respect to God as the principal agent, and man as the instrument. For, it is certain that many works of that kind are found in Christ; such were all of his miracles, which were done by the Word of God through the flesh as the instrument. But what is rejected is one operation with respect to God and man, as being the proper and principal cause; for, that is said to be the proper and principal cause, which acts by its own power, which it has from its own form and essence.

Now let us illustrate this with some examples. When Christ cured fevers by placing his hands on the sick persons, the imposition of the hands was a proper and principal operation of the humanity, because he had that from his own proper form; but the expulsion of the fever was the proper and principal operation of the Divinity, because the hand of Christ did not have this from his own form, but only as it is applied by God to that work. To say, however, that to impose hands was the proper operation of the Divinity, or to expel the fever was proper to the humanity, and therefore that there was only one operation—to impose hands and to expel the fever—is to confuse the operations and the natures, and this is the heresy condemned in that Council.

Therefore, to sacrifice, which is the office of the mediator, is proper to Christ as he is man; for it pertains to him according to his human form, as is clear, because it pertains also to ordinary men. Therefore, if this same thing pertains to Christ as he is God, there will be the same operation of both natures as a proper and principal cause, unless they want the Divinity to be the instrument of the humanity, than which nothing more absurd can be thought. Wherefore with this opinion the heresy of the Monothelites and Eutychians is introduced, which has already with great effort been condemned and almost eliminated.

Josias responds that it is not absolutely the same action of the Divinity and the humanity to sacrifice, although it is one work; for, the substance of the work is properly that of the humanity, but the efficacy and the dignity of the work is proper to the Divinity.

On the contrary. If that were the case, the Divinity could not be called priest and pontiff, as however Samicius called it; nor could he be said to be sacrificing, just as God is not said to sleep or to walk, just because he gives us the power to sleep or to walk. Moreover, the efficacy and dignity of Christ's sacrifice is not a physical action, or some influx or real efficacy of the Divinity in that work; for then the efficacy, and therefore

the sacrifice would not pertain any more to the Son than it would to the Father and the Holy Spirit, since every operation is common, which pertains to them through the divine essence.

Therefore, you will ask, does the sacrifice of Christ have infinite efficacy and dignity? It does have it because it is the sacrifice of a divine person, although accomplished in the human nature. As also the same work done by a king and a private person differ very much according to the value, by reason of the dignity of doers; and nevertheless the royal majesty adds nothing physical or real to that work. Therefore, it cannot in any way be conceded that "to sacrifice" is an action of both natures, unless someone wants to fall into the heresy of the Monothelites, which now for a long time has been rejected and condemned.

CHAPTER VI

THE ARGUMENTS OF ADVERSARIES TAKEN FROM THE SCRIPTURES ARE ANSWERED

First of all, they raise an objection based on the words of the Lord in John 10:17, *I lay down my life.* The Mediator says this, Calvin said in his letter to the Poles, and he does not say it as man, but as God; for no one has the choice of life and death except God.

I respond that to give one's life does not pertain to God, but to man, although the power of giving it at one's pleasure was given to man by God; for, what is "to give one's life" but to die? And what is "to resume one's life" but to rise from the dead? But to die and to resurrect certainly pertain to man, not to God. And this is the way the holy Fathers explain these words.

Augustine in tractate 47 accepts the life for the substance of the soul; and he asks whose function it is to lay down his life, whether it is the Word, or the flesh, or the soul itself. And he responds that it is not the function of the Word, because the Word never loses his life; and it is not the soul, because the soul cannot be separated from itself; but it is the function of the flesh, because sometimes it loses life, and sometimes it receives it. *The flesh,* he said, *lays down its life, and the flesh takes it up again, but the flesh does not do it by its own power, but with the power of the one dwelling in the flesh.* And in book 3, chapter 14 against Maximinus he said: *What do you think he is referring to, when he says clearly as man—I have power to lay down my life, etc.* Chrysostom also several times says regarding this text that it is said by Christ according to his humanity. Therefore, let Calvin see which authors he is following, when he attributes to the divinity—to lay down his life and to take it up again.

Again they quote this from 2 Cor. 5:18: *All this is from God, who through Christ reconciled us to himself.* And after that: *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.* And further one: *So we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.* And Col. 1:20: *Through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace by the blood of the cross:* but to reconcile, to exhort, to pacify are works of the mediator; therefore Christ as God was the mediator.

I respond, first of all, that to reconcile, to exhort, to pacify are not always the work of a mediator; for the role of a mediator is to reconcile one party with another; but if someone by himself reconciles himself with an enemy, he is not called a mediator. Therefore, every mediator reconciles, but not everyone who reconciles is necessarily a mediator. Add to this also: it is one thing to reconcile through a mediator, but it is something else to be a mediator. For one of the disagreeing parties can obtain a mediator, and through him reconciliation, but the party himself will not be the mediator. Therefore in this way God reconciled us with himself, but through a mediator he sent to us.

Finally, they cite this from Heb. 4:14: *We have a great high priest who has passed through the heavens.* Likewise they quote this in Heb. 7:3: *He is without father or mother or genealogy.* For, to pass through the heavens cannot pertain to a plain man, nor is there any priest without father and without mother, except Christ who is God and man. For he,

as God, lacks a mother, as man he lacks a father; therefore Christ is a priest, and therefore he is the mediator according to both natures. Therefore Athanasius in his book on the humility of the Word, and Cyril in chapter 10 of his letter to Nestorius confess that the Word himself is priest.

I respond: all these things rightly prove that the person of our high priest is divine, which is something we willingly admit. For, Jesus is truly the supreme high priest, who passed through the heavens, and who is without father and without mother, and at the same time he does have a father and a mother. He is God, but he did not pass through the heavens as God; and as man he does not lack a mother, or does he have a father. And finally, it is not as God that he is high priest; for, the power, whereby Christ passed through the heavens, was from God. However, to pass through the heavens, since it is to be moved locally, does not pertain to Christ according to the form of God, which is immutable, but it pertains to him only according to the form of man.

Similarly, Christ lacks a father, but as man; he lacks a mother, but as God. But the same one has a father, because he is God from God, and he has a mother, because he is the son of man. Finally, God the Word, as Athanasius and Cyril rightly teach, is a priest, but according to the form of man, as the same Cyril says in his Apology.

CHAPTER VII

THE TESTIMONIES OF THE FATHERS, WHICH THE ADVERSARIES CITE, ARE EXPLAINED

In the second place they cite the testimonies of the Fathers. And first of all they raise an objection from Dionysius the Areopagite who, in letter 4 to Cajus, says that Christ administered θεανδρικήν ένεργειαν, that is, the manly operation of God. And the same thing is said in chapter 2 on the divine names.

I respond that this opinion of Dionysius can be understood in three ways.

First, if someone understands by the manly operation of God one operation that is proper to both natures, as our adversaries seem to say, then that is clearly erroneous; for in session 8 of the Sixth Council Macharius, a Monothelite heretic, quoted this very sentence from Dionysius in this sense, in order to support his heresy.

Secondly, any work of Christ can be called a manly operation of God, in which the divinity and the humanity work together, but are distinct and are actually two. The sentence in this sense is true, and intended by the author. And in this way it is explained by Sophronius in the famous Oration, which was read at the eleventh session of the Sixth Council, where he distinguished three kinds of works of Christ: some purely divine, like to create and to conserve all creatures; some purely human, like eating and drinking; some partly divine and partly human, like walking on water. For, walking is proper to men, but to give solidity to water belongs to God. And these actions are called θεανδρικά, that is, divine-human actions, like all the miracles of Christ, but not all the works of Christ. In addition, such works are not works of the mediator as mediator, that is, to sacrifice and to pray; for, all of these things are human.

There is also a third meaning of the theandric actions derived from book 3, chapter 19 of Damascene; there he teaches that every action of Christ can be called theandric by reason of the operation of the suppositum. For, the man-God always was acting, not as pure God, or as pure man. In this way also Damascene seems to explain what St. Leo says in letter 10, namely, that both natures operate in communion with the other, which is proper; for he wants it to be in communion with the other, as if it were said, while union is maintained with the other in the same suppositum.

Secondly, they raise an objection from Irenaeus, who said in book 3, chapter 20: *It was necessary that the mediator between God and men, through his own domesticity towards both and for friendship and harmony, should be both, and bring it about that God would assume man, and that man would submit himself to God.* Likewise, they cite similar words from Epiphanius in Ancor. (near the middle), Chrysostom, Ambrose, Theodoretus, and Theophylact on 1 Tim. 2:5; and they say that the mediator between God and men must have both natures in himself, in order to bring about friendship between God and men.

I respond: all of these are speaking about the substantial mediation, which was accomplished in Christ through the Incarnation, and which was necessary for mediation through operation; for, unless the Christ-God were a man, there would not be a divine suppositum operating in a human nature, and therefore the works of the mediator would

not have infinite value. Therefore, formally Christ is the mediator, regarding the mediation of operation, through his humanity alone; however, in order for him to be the mediator, and to be able to save the whole world in strict justice, besides the form of humanity he must also have a divine suppositum. But he could not have a divine suppositum in the human nature, unless there were in it the substantial mediation of the two natures.

Thirdly, they raise an objection from Augustine in chapter 108 of the Enchiridion, where he said: *For* we *would not be liberated through that one mediator between God and men, unless he were also God.* Likewise in book 1, chapter 35 on the Harmony of the Gospels: *Therefore Christ is said to be the mediator between God and men, between immortal God and mortal man, God and man reconciling man to God, remaining what he was, having become what he was not.* Likewise in chapter 12 of his homily on the sheep: *No man is mediator outside the divinity.* Also: *Divine humanity and the human divinity is the mediatrix.* Likewise in book 9, chapter 15 of *The City of God: We must seek a mediator, who is not only man, but also God.*

I respond: Augustine is speaking about the person, who should give dignity to the work; this is evident, both from the texts cited by us, and from book 9, chapter 15 cited by the adversaries. For, after Augustine had said that the mediator must be both God and man, he adds: *I do not say that he is mediator because he is the Word, for as the Word he is supremely blessed and supremely immortal, and therefore far from miserable mortals; but he is mediator as he is man.*

CHAPTER VIII

ARGUMENTS TAKEN FROM REASON ARE ANSWERED

Finally, they make some objections from reason. To renew hearts, and to give the Holy Spirit are works of the mediator, because Augustine teaches in chapter 33 of the Enchiridion that we receive the Holy Spirit through the Mediator; nevertheless, it is certain that to give the Holy Spirit and to renew hearts pertains to God alone. Likewise, teaching is a work of the mediator, and still Augustine in his book on teaching says that only God is the true teacher, who teaches men knowledge; therefore Christ as God is the mediator.

I respond: to give the Holy Spirit meritoriously belongs to the mediator, but this way of giving the Spirit does not belong formally to God, but to man; but to give the Holy Spirit, and to renew hearts effectively, and as the author of the gift, does not pertain to the mediator, but to him before whom the mediator intercedes, that is, God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit. And it is clear, because this gift of the Holy Spirit, and all enlightenment is given by the whole Trinity; if a donation of this kind pertains to the mediator, the whole Trinity would be mediator.

Similarly, teaching pertains principally to God, that is, the Trinity; to teach as an instrument belongs to man; therefore Christ as God is the true and principal teacher and master; the same Christ as man, being the mediator between God and men, was teacher as the instrument of the divinity, but an instrument joined and singular, not separated and common, in the way that the Apostles and Prophets were instruments.

The second argument is that of Calvin in his letter to the Poles. Christ was the head of angels and men, even before the fall of Adam, while the nature of things remained intact, as in Col. 1:15: *The first-born of all creation.* Therefore Christ was also mediator before the fall of the first man; but then Christ was not yet a man; therefore as God he was the head of men and of angels, and he was mediator.

Add to this that Chrysostom, Augustine and Jerome in their Commentaries on Gal. 3:19, while explaining the words, *a law ordained by angels through a mediator,* say that the law was given through Christ the mediator, and that is what Paul means in this place. Indeed, Jerome goes even further and says that through this mediator not only was the law given, but also the world was created. But it is certain that Christ was not a man, when the law was given to the Hebrews, and much less, when the world was created. Therefore it follows necessarily that he was mediator according to the form of God.

I respond that Christ as God even before the fall of angels and men was their head, however not he alone, but also the Father and the Holy Spirit. It is false that Christ was the mediator of angels and of men before sin; otherwise, we would also make the Father and the Holy Spirit mediators. For, first of all, Scripture does indeed make Christ the head of all angles and men in Eph. 1:22 and Col. 1:18, but it never makes him the mediator of angels. For, Paul in 1 Tim. 2:5 when he speaks about the mediator, affirms in clear words that Christ is the mediator between God

and men.

However, Augustine in chapter 108 of the Enchiridion adds this: that if man had not sinned, he would not have needed Christ the mediator. And on Gal. 3 he says that Christ is not the mediator between God and angels, but between God and men only, because the angels who did not sin never had to be reconciled; and those who have not sinned do not need a mediator.

Therefore what Calvin says about the mediator Christ before the sin of Adam is expressly contrary to Augustine, and seems to be manifest Arianism. For Calvin does not for this reason make Christ the mediator before the Incarnation, that because of the Incarnation and his foreseen merits, he thinks that grace was given to the angels and to the first man, which some Catholics seem to think, whose opinion I will not now contest; but because he thinks that the eternal Word himself was, before the Incarnation, performing the function of mediator between the Father and the angels, and also the men constituted in the state of innocence; and this cannot be said without a suspicion of Arianism. For, the mediator as mediator is, since he must sacrifice, supplicate, intercede, necessarily less than God, to whom he sacrifices, supplicates, and before whom he intercedes; therefore if Christ, when as yet he was not man, was the mediator, certainly since he was not yet man, was inferior to the Father; and then he was nothing but God; therefore as God he was less than God the Father.

What Calvin said in book 2, chapter 12 § 4 does not seem to be much different from this heresy: *I confess,* he said, *that in the first order of creation, and in the integral state of nature he was set over the angels and men as head. For this reason he is said by St. Paul to be the first-born of every creature.* These are his words. So he makes the Son alone, even before the Incarnation, the head of angels and men; for, he makes him head, who is the first-born of every creature, but only the Son is the first-born of every creature. But if the Son alone was the head of angels and men, then the Son had some influence on angels and men, which the Father did not have; therefore the works of the Trinity are not undivided, and therefore there is not one nature and essence of the Trinity.

Then, what does this mean: *the Son as God was set as head over angels and men?* For by whom, I ask, was he set up as head? Was it not by the Father? Therefore, the Son was a minister of the Father and quasi vicar, even before he was man. What else is it that the Arians want?

The text of the Apostle in Col. 1:15 offers no help to Calvin. For, when he says that Christ is the first-born of every creature, either he is speaking about Christ according to the form of a servant, or, as Chrysostom explains it, he is speaking about Christ according to the form of a servant, but he does not make him the first-born brother of creatures, but means that he was begotten by the Father, before any creature was made, according to the saying in Prov. 8:22: *The Lord created me at the beginning of his work, the first of his acts of old.* But we said a lot about this in the first book.

Now we will consider the view of the Fathers, who say that Christ the mediator

gave the Law to the Hebrews, or created the world.

I respond that the Fathers are talking about the mediator materially, not formally. For, they do not say that Christ was the mediator in creating the world, or in giving the Law; but they say that Christ the mediator, that is, that person who later was to become the mediator, is the true God, and author of the world and of the Law and of all things. Hence Chrysostom expressly says that Christ was the author of the Law, and therefore that he could abrogate it. Therefore, it follows that he did it not as mediator, but as the primary author. For a mediator is not an author, nor can he abrogate the Law, who is not already the author. And in the same place Augustine says that Christ is indeed the mediator, but that he mediates between the whole Trinity and sinful men. From this it follows again that he was not the mediator in the proper sense, when there were no men sinners.

CHAPTER IX

IT IS SHOWN THAT CHRIST ALSO MERITED SOMETHING FOR HIMSELF

Now there is the final question, that is, whether Christ by his works and labors gained grace and glory not only for all of us, but also for himself. Indeed, the theological doctors in their comments on the Master in 3 Sent., dist. 18, agree among themselves, and teach with one consent that Christ, besides the goods that he gained for us by his labors, also merited for himself the glory of his body, and the exaltation of his name.

Calvin is opposed to this in book 2, chapter 17 § 6 where he says: *To ask whether he merited for himself, which Lombard and the Scholastics do, is a curiosity not less stupid than the rash definition, where they assert this same thing. For, why was it necessary for the only Son of God to descend in order to acquire for himself something new? And God, in explaining his counsel, removes all doubt. For the Father is not said to have consulted the utility of the Son in his merits, but to have handed him over to death, nor did he spare him, because he loved the world. And the statements of the prophets should be noted: A Son has been born for us. Likewise: Rejoice, O Sion, because your king has come to you: otherwise also that confirmation of love would grow cold, which Paul praises, because Christ suffered death for his enemies. Therefore also we gather that he had no concern for himself; he affirms that clearly, when he says: I am sacrificing myself for them. He testifies also that he gained nothing, since he transferred the fruit of his holiness to others. And certainly this is especially worthy of note, that Christ, in order to dedicate himself totally for our salvation, in a certain sense forgot himself.* These are his words. And after that he also said: *By what merits could a man obtain that he be the judge of the world, the head of angels, and to share in the supreme power of God?*

However, these statements do not wipe out the truth. Therefore, we say that Christ merited for himself all the things that he received after his passion. And this is proved by express texts of Scripture. There is Phil. 2:8: *And being found in human form he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even death on a cross. Therefore also God has highly exalted him and bestowed on him the name, etc.* And also Heb. 2:9: *We see Jesus crowned with glory and honor because of the suffering of death.*

Calvin responds that by these testimonies it means only that Christ after his passion had glory, but not that one was caused by the other, as when it is said in Luke 24:26:// *was necessary that Christ should suffer these things and so enter into his glory.*

But first of all, that text can signify the cause; for, it is as if it were said: *It is necessary to conquer and so to triumph.* Also, those two texts are not completely similar; for, Phil. 2:8 and Heb. 2:9 have the preposition "because of *(propter),* and this word everywhere usually signifies the cause. Then the word "also" in the expression, *Therefore also God has highly exalted him,* openly indicates the cause. For the meaning is: *Christ obeyed God, and in return God honored him;* as in Matt. 16:18 after the confession of Peter, the Lord says to him: *And I tell you, that you are Peter, etc.* Here Jerome said: *His true confession received a reward.*

Finally, all the Fathers explained it in this way. Chrysostom in homily 7 on the letter

to the Philippians said: *Christ offered total obedience, and therefore also he received the highest honor, etc.* There Chrysostom is exhorting the people to practice obedience and humility, and this exhortation would be quite pointless, if that "therefore" did not refer to the cause.

Ambrose on Phil. 2:8 said: *What and how much his humility merited, I have shown, etc.* Augustine in tractate 104 on John, while treating this text said: *Humility merits renown, the renown of humility is the reward, but this was done in the form of a servant.* See also Cyril in book 3, chapter 2 on his Theses, Basil in book 4 on Eunomius, Augustine in book 2, chapter 5 against Maximinius and in book 3, chapter 2; also Theophylact, Oecumenius, Primarius, Bede, Anselm and others on this text. For, all of them conclude from these texts that Christ merited by his humility glory, not only for us, but also for himself. And certainly it is far better to follow so many of the older Fathers, Greek and Latin in their explanation of the Scriptures, than those new doctors, who seem to think they are not acting wisely unless they contradict everything. Moreover, there is also the support of reason; for, it is better, all things being equal, to gain something by merit, rather than without merit.

St. Thomas responds in III, q. 19, a. 3, that Christ had to have everything in the best way; but there are some good things so βχοβίίβηζ that it is better never to have lacked them, than to acquire them by merit, because the lack of them for a time detracts more from the perfection of someone, than the dignity of meriting it; and still someone cannot merit them, unless at some time he lacked them. And such things are grace, glory, knowledge, and especially the hypostatic union—all of which Christ had from the beginning. But the glory of his body, and the exaltation of his name are lesser things than the dignity of meriting, and therefore it was a better thing for him to lack them for a time, and then by merit to acquire them, than to lack the dignity of meriting.

CHAPTER X

CALVIN'S ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

Calvin's arguments are not very intimidating. For, when he says: what need was there for the only Son of God to descend in order to obtain something new for himself?

I respond that the Son of God did not need anything, nor did he descend in order to obtain something for himself; for, the one who descended was God, not man, in fact the reason for descending was to become man, and to empty himself. But after he had descended, and had obtained the form of a servant, he did acquire something for himself in that form which he had assumed, not in that whereby he had descended. Also, who can contest the fact that he did lack something, being in the form of a servant, before his resurrection?

You will say: the glory of the body follows per se from the glory of the soul; but an addition does not come under the idea of merit.

I respond first of all that the glory of the body does not seem to be absolutely an addition, because it follows from the glory of the soul according to the determination of God, and the suitability of the merits; for, God willed that the glory of the soul should redound in the body, because the glory of the soul is acquired by the acts of the soul, which are performed in the body. And therefore both the glory of the soul and the glory of the body fall under the notion of merit. Then what forbids that which is accessory to fall under the notion of merit? Although now it is due by reason of that to which it belongs, still it can fall under the notion of merit so that it is owed under another title. Wherefore although we admit that the glory of the body was due to Christ, even if he did not strive for it, nevertheless, what is owed in one way can also be owed in another way; therefore God willed that the glory of the body should be due to Christ even by the right of a reward and payment.

Calvin's second argument is taken from texts where it is said that Christ worked for us all the way to his death, as in Rom. 8:32: *He did not spare his own Son but gave him up for 113* Isa. 9:6: *Tous a child is born.* Zech. 9:9: *Behold, your king comes to you.* John 17:19: *For their sake I consecrate myself.*

I respond in the first place: in none of these texts is it said that Christ worked only for us, and therefore that all these things accomplished nothing other than that Christ performed these works so that the works of Christ should be beneficial for us, which we in no way deny. But then I add that in these texts no mention was made of the glory itself of Christ, as if he labored for our sake only, because we were the cause without which he would not have suffered. For, if Adam had remained in the innocence, in which he was created, without any doubt the Son of God would not have suffered, and perhaps also he would not have assumed human flesh, as even Calvin teaches in book 2, chapter 12 §4 of the Institutes.

Now the third argument of Calvin went like this: that confirmation of love grew cold, which Paul commends in Rom. 5:8, because Christ suffered death for his enemies.

But I respond that real merit does not prevent the ardor of the love of God for men

from being shown. For, first of all, the Scriptures, for the most part, extol the love of God the Father, who had nothing to gain. John 3:16, *God so loved the world that he gave his only Son;* and Rom. 8:32, *God did not spare his own Son, etc.*

Then also the great love of Christ appears, if you look at his divine person, to whom there accrues no advantage, and Paul proposes this to us in 2 Cor. 8:9: *You know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor.* And Phil 2:6: *Though he was in the form of God...he emptied himself, etc.*

Finally also the great love of Christ the man appears, who could without passion and death have merited for himself the glory of his body and the exaltation of his name by other acts; however, he willed to die, and to die for his enemies, that the redemption might be abundant. But that Christ did not completely forget himself, as Calvin says, is clear from the words in John 17:5: *Father, glorify me with the glory which I had with you.* Here he is asking God for the glory of the resurrection and the exaltation of his name, as St, Augustine explains in his comments on this verse.

The last argument was this: by what merits could a man obtain that he be judge of the world and head of the angels, and that he share in the supreme power of God, and that the majesty of God is present in him, concerning whom all the virtues of men and angels could not equal a thousandth part?

But the answer is easy. For, we do not teach that Christ by his merits obtained these things—that he be the head of angels, that he share in the supreme power of God, and that the majesty of God should be present in him: for if he merited those things, he would also have merited the hypostatic union, which Augustine openly denies in chapter 15 of his book on the predestination of the Saints, and we also previously have denied.

In addition, Christ could easily have merited to be the judge of the world. For, if the merits of Christ were not sufficient for this, that he should become the judge of the world, much less were they sufficient for the reconciliation of the whole world. For, it was something greater and more difficult to expiate the sins of the whole world, than to be constituted the judge of the world; and nevertheless in 1 John 2:2 it is said that the blood of Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not only for ours, but also for those of the whole world.

The end of the second general Controversy

LAUS DEO, VIRGINIQUE MATRI MARIAE

THE THIRD GENERAL CONTROVERSY

ON THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF

TREATED IN FIVE BOOKS

THE THIRD GENERAL CONTROVERSY
ON THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF

TREATED IN FIVE BOOKS

INDEX OF THE BOOKS AND CHAPTERS OF THE THIRD CONTROVERSY

BOOK ONE

ON THE PRIMACY OF ST. PETER IN THE CHURCH MILITANT.

Preface to the books on the Sovereign Pontiff..... 601

I. The question is asked: What is the best form of government?.....608
II. The first proposition is proved—that simple Monarch is preferable to simple Aristocracy and Democracy.....610
III. That Monarchy mixed with Aristocracy and Democracy is more beneficial in this life than simple Monarchy..... 617
IV. Independently of the circumstances, simple Monarchy is absolutely and simply the best form.....618
V. Here is the second question: Should the government of the Church be monarchic?.....620
VI. The government of the Church is not democratic..... 622
VII. Ecclesiastical authority is not under the control of secular Princes..... 627
Vin. The government of the Church is not principally in the hands of the Bishops. 632
IX. Ecclesiastical government chiefly should be monarchic..... 636
X. A third question is proposed and the Monarchy of Peter is proved from Matt. 16..... 650
XI. What it means for the Church to be built upon a rock in Matt. 16..... 657
XII. Who is the one to whom it is said: I will give you the keys (Matt. 16:19)?.... 659
XIII. What is understood by the keys in Matt. 16:19?.....671
XIV. It was said by Christ to Peter alone in John 21 : Feed my sheep.....674
XV. The meaning of "feed" (Pasce) in John 21..... 676

XVI. By the words "my sheep" in John 21 the whole Church is signified..... 678
XVII. The first prerogative of Peter is explained from the change of his name..... 685
XVIII. The second prerogative is explained from the way in which the Apostles are named by the Evangelists..... 687
XIX. Four other prerogatives are explained from the Gospel of St. Matthew..... 690
XX. Four other prerogatives are explained from the Gospel of St. Luke..... 692
XXI. Two others are explained from the Gospel of St. John..... 694
XXII. Another nine prerogatives are explained from the Acts of the Apostles and the letter to the Galatians..... 695
XXIII. Other prerogatives are proposed from various authors..... 698
XXIV. Three final prerogatives are presented..... 702
XXV. The primacy of Peter is confirmed by the testimonies of the Greek and Latin Fathers..... 706
XXVI. The argument from the comparison of Peter with James is refuted..... 711
XXVII. On the comparison of Peter with Paul..... 713
XXVIII. The objection concerning the fifteen sins of Peter, proposed by the Magdebuigenses, is refuted..... 717

BOOK TWO

ON THE SUCCESSION OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF IN THAT PRIMACY

I. A question is proposed: Whether St. Peter was in Rome and died there as its bishop..... 722
II. Peter was in Rome..... 724
III. St. Peter died in Rome..... 729
IV. Peter in Rome was its bishop until his death..... 733
V. The first aigument of the heretics is refuted..... 737
VI. The second argument is refuted..... 741
VII. Another five argument are refuted..... 749
VIII. Another eight arguments are refuted..... 752
IX. The sixteenth argument is refuted..... 754
X. The seventeenth argument is refuted..... 756
XI. The last argument is refuted..... 757
XII. It is proved from divine law and from the nature of succession that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the ecclesiastical monarchy..... 758
XIII. The same point is proved from the councils..... 765
XIV. The same point is proved from the testimonies of the Sovereign Pontiffs..... 769

XV. The same point is proved from the Greek Fathers.....776
XVI. The same point is proved from the Latin Fathers.....779
XVII. The same point is proved from the origin and antiquity of the primacy.....786
XVIII. The same point is proved from the authority which the Roman Pontiff exercised over the other bishops.....795
XIX. The same point is proved from laws, dispensations and censures.....801
XX. The same point is proved from the vicars of the Pope.....804
XXI. The same point is proved from the right of appeals.....805
XXII. The arguments of Nilus on the right of appeals is refuted.....807
XXIII. The first aigument of the Lutherans is refuted.....809
XXIV. Three other arguments are refuted.....811
XXV. The last aigument is refuted.....813
XXVI. The same point is proved from the fact that the Roman Pontiff is not judged by anyone.....821
XXVII. The arguments of Nilus are refuted.....824
XXVIII. Calvin's objections are refuted.....829
XXIX. Another nine aiguments are refuted.....831
XXX. The last aigument is refuted, and the question is asked: Whether a heretical Pope can be deposed.....836
XXXI. The same point is proved from the names, which customarily are attributed to the Roman Pontiff.....841

BOOK THREE

ON THE ANTICHRIST: HE HAS NOTHING IN COMMON WITH THE ROMAN PONTIFF

I. The argument about the Antichrist is proposed.....847
II. The Antichrist is a certain future man.....850
III. It is shown that the Antichrist has not yet come.....855
IV. The first demonstration, that Antichrist has not yet come, is explained.....861
V. The second demonstration is explained.....864
VI. The third demonstration is explained.....868
VII. The fourth demonstration is explained.....872
VIII. The fifth demonstration is explained.....874
IX. The sixth demonstration is explained.....878
X. On the name of Antichrist.....880

XI. On the mark of Antichrist.... 885
XII. On the generation of Antichrist.... 888
XIII. On the throne of Antichrist.... 892
XIV. On the doctrine of Antichrist.... 899
XV. On the miracles of Antichrist.... 905
XVI. On the kingdom and battles of Antichrist.... 908
XVII. On Gog and Magog.... 911
XVIII. The absurdities of the heretics, by which they do not so much prove as shamelessly affirm that the Pope is Antichrist, are refuted.... 916
XIX. The trifles of the Schmalchaldic synod of the Lutherans are refuted. Calvin's lies are refuted.... 918
XX. Calvin's lies are refuted.... 921
XXI. The lies of Illyricus are refuted.... 923
XXII. The trifles of Tilmann are refuted.... 932
XXIII. The lies of Chytraeus are refuted.... 934
XXIV. The arguments of Calvin and Illyricus are refuted. They try to prove that the Pope is no longer a bishop; the myth about the female Pope Joan is also refuted.... 948

BOOK FOUR

ON THE POWER OF THE ROMAN PONTIFF IN SPIRITUAL MATTERS.

I. The Pope is the supreme judge in deciding controversies over faith and morals 953
II. A question is asked: Is the judgment of the Pope certain?.... 956
III. The first proposition is established concerning the infallible judgement of the Sovereign Pontiff.... 958
IV. On the particular Roman Church.... 965
V. On decrees of morals.... 968
VI. On the Pontiff as he is a particular person.... 970
VII. Objections taken from reason are refuted.... 971
VIII. On the errors that are falsely attributed to the Roman Pontiffs, Peter Linus, Cletus, Telesphorus, Victor, Zephorinus, Urban, Pontian, Cornelius and Marcellinus, who were not only Pontiffs, but also martyrs.... 974
IX. On the objections made to Liberius and Felix II.... 980
X. On Siricius, Innocent, and another seven Pontiffs.... 985
XI. On Honorius 1.... 990

XII. On seven other Pontiffs.... 998
XIII. On Gregory VII.... 1002
XTV. On the other Pontiffs, to whom an error in faith is falsely attributed.... 1009
XV. A question is proposed: Does the Sovereign Pontiff have truly coactive jurisdiction, so that he can make laws, which oblige in conscience, and judge and punish transgressors?.... 1015
XVI. It is proved by the testimony of the word of God that the Pontiffs can establish true laws.... 1018
XVII. The argument of the adversaries taken from the Scriptures are refuted.... 1030
XVIII. The aigument from the comparison of laws is refuted.... 1035
XΓX. The argument taken from examples is refuted.... 1038
XX. Two arguments taken from the nature of conscience are refuted.... 1039
XXL Aiguments taken from the Fathers are refuted.... 1041
XXII. The last question is proposed: Does Christ confer ecclesiastical jurisdiction immediately on the Sovereign Pontiff alone?.... 1044
XXIII. The apostles received all jurisdiction from Christ.... 1046
XXIV. All bishops receive their jurisdiction from the Pope.... 1048
XXV. The aiguments of the adversaries are refuted.... 1051

BOOK FIVE

ON THE TEMPORAL DOMINION AND POWER OF THE SAME PONTIFF

I. A question is raised about the temporal power.... 1054
II. The Pope is not lord of the whole world.... 1056
III. The Pope is not lord of the whole Christian world.... 1058
IV. The Pope does not have any purely temporal jurisdiction directly by divine law.... 1060
V. The contrary arguments are refuted.... 1065
VI. The Pope has supreme temporal power indirectly.... 1070
VII. The opinion of theologians is proved by reasons.... 1072
VIII. The same point is proved by examples.... 1076
IX. That one man is at the same time both an ecclesiastical and a political ruler does not conflict with the word of God.... 1081
X. The contrary aiguments are refuted.... 1084

PREFACE

TO THE BOOKS

ON THE SUPREME PONTIFF

PRESENTED IN THE ROMAN COLLEGE

MDLXXVH

Before we begin the argument concerning the Supreme Pontiff, I thought a few preliminary things should be said. First, on the usefulness and importance of presenting this argument; then about those who strove to oppose the Roman primacy in writings, or also those on the other side who defended it, from the beginning of the Church down to our own time; finally, about the nature and order in which the present Controversy, which necessarily will be quite lengthy, is to be treated and explained by us.

Indeed the importance of the question about the pontiff and its usefulness will be understood especially for two reasons: from the importance of the matter with which it is concerned, which is called in doubt, and from the large number and hostility of the adversaries. For, what is this all about, when the concern is with the Supreme Pontiff? I will say very briefly—it is about the whole nature of Christianity. For, this is the question: should the Church continue to exist, or should it be dissolved and ruined? For, what else is it to ask whether the foundation should be removed from a building, a shepherd from his flock, a general from his army, the sun from the stars, the head from the body, but that it is necessaiy to destroy a building, to scatter the flock, to put an army to flight, to darken the sky, to throw out a body?

Moreover, the adversaries, that is, the heretics, since in almost all the other dogmas disagree among themselves no less than they do with us, nevertheless they all agree on this point—that they oppose the Roman Pontiff with their whole strength and with great hostility. Thus, there have never been enemies of Christ and the Church, who did not at the same time wage war against this See. It seems to me that Isaiah the prophet foresaw and predicted these two points, that is, the importance and the usefulness of the Church, when he said: *Behold, I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure foundation.* And this is the stone for the hostility and attacks of the heretics: *It is a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling.* Although the latter words are not in the same place with the former (these are contained in 8:14 and the former in 28:16), nevertheless the Apostle Paul in Rom. 9:32-33 and the Apostle Peter in 1 Pet. 2:6 so join together all these words of the prophet that no one can doubt but that they refer to the same end and purpose. And although we know that these words apply especially to Christ, still we think they are not appropriately suited for the Vicar of Christ.

Therefore, what are the foundations of Zion? The Apostle John explains this in the book of Revelation; for, while describing all the parts and embellishments of this same holy city, among other things he says this: *And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb* (Rev. 21:14). Therefore the Apostles are the foundation of Zion; among these a singular stone is listed and excels: *Behold,* he said, *I am laying in Zion for a foundation a stone.* Who that stone is everyone knows who reads the Gospels. For, since among the twelve Apostles one is called Simon, the Lord changed his name, and said he wanted him to be called Peter instead of Simon, that is, the "rock"; for, in the Aramaic language, which the Lord doubtless used, Cephas means rock (= Peter). Therefore, the Lord said to him: *You are Simon, but you will be called Cephas,* that is, *Rock,* or as we Latins say more appropriately "Peter." And again in another place: Ibw *are Peter,* or, you are the *rock, and on this rock I will build my Church.* Here is the stone for you for the foundation of Zion. But what kind of a stone do you think it is? *A tested stone,* he said, *a precious stone, of a sure foundation.* A tested stone: since this stone has been tested by every kind of test, all the gates of hell have attacked it.

I will omit the persecutions of the Jews and Gentiles, which were waged against this See along with the rest of the Church; certainly above all many heretics not once or twice, openly have waged war with this See with new armies and weapons. Then the envy and pride of the Greeks did not cease to be in conflict with this See before they were conquered by the emperor of the Turks and also lost their religion with their dignity. Then powerful Christian emperors, and what is even worse under the name of religion and piety often have tried to overturn and destroy this very See, from whom the scepter of the <oman Empire had been given to them.

For you know what tragedies were caused in the Church at various times by rulers ike Henry IV, Henry V, Otto IV, Frederick II and several others. And as if these were not enough, Satan also stirred up the Roman people against the pontiffs. There exists the serious letter of St. Bernard to the senate and people of Rome, in which he tries to put an end to their rebellion against Pope Eugene, which had been incited by the devil. But these turbulent and dangerous rebellions, aimed at destroying the Roman Pontiff, lasted not only for several days, but also for several months, and years, indeed even centuries.

Grave schisms also took place, and several of them among the Roman Pontiffs themselves, by which the See of Peter could in no way not give in, and finally be broken and destroyed, if it were not a strong and tested rock, and placed in the foundation of Zion by him who said: *And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* And lest perhaps we should think, because of the incorrupt life and good morals of the Supreme Pontiffs, that this See would stand permanently, finally God permitted that also certain less worthy pontiffs should occupy this See for a time and rule. Men of this sort were Stephen IV, Leo V, Christopher I, Sergius III, John XII, and not a few others, if it is true what has been written about them by the historians concerning their life and deeds.

Therefore it means nothing that the heretics try so hard to accuse some of these pontiffs of vices. For we acknowledge and admit that there were not a few. But it is so far removed that by them the glory of this See should be obscured or diminished, that rather by them it grows strongly and is magnified. Hence we understand that it is not by human

planning, prudence, or strength that the Roman See has existed so long, but because this rock has been made so firm by the Lord, divinely laid, guarded by the angels and by the special providence and protection of God, that against it the gates of hell can in no way prevail, whether by those gates the persecution of tyrants, or the raging of heretics, or the fury of schismatics, or wickedness and shameful crimes are the cause. Therefore God placed a tested stone in the foundation of Zion; not just tested, but also a cornerstone, which connects two walls. It seems to me that it was placed there to demonstrate the difference between the pontiff of the Christians and the Jews. For, that stone was indeed a foundation, but it was not a cornerstone; for it did not support two walls, but only one. But our stone is a cornerstone; for both Jews and Gentiles, like two walls joined together, and making one Christian Church, are supported by this one cornerstone.

Isaiah adds—*and precious.* By this one word an infinite treasure of good things is signified, which are derived from the See of Peter abundantly for the whole Church. By whom were those sent who preached the Gospel to Germany, France, England, and other distant provinces, unless it were by this See? Where were the Bishops driven from their dioceses, exiles in the whole world, like Athanasius long ago and Peter at Alexandria, Paul and Chrysostom at Constantinople, unless it were to this See? From where do we have the explanation of dogmas, the rites of the Sacraments, the granting of indulgences, unless it is from this See?

I will omit some things which would be too many to enumerate, but from where do we obtain agreement in doctrine, the bond of peace, the unity of Faith which is salvation itself and the life of religion, if it is not from this See? For otherwise why is it that the contemporary heretics until now have never been able to convene one general Council, in which all agreed on at least one article, since they control several large provinces, like England, Scotland, Denmark, Norway, Switzerland, and no small part of Germany, Poland, Bohemia and Hungary? Also why is it that Greece since the year 800, when it separated from the See of Peter and the Roman Church, through another almost 800 years has never celebrated a Council in order to decide some questions in a peaceful way by common consent? While we, on the contrary, since that time have held about ten general Councils quite frequently, the last of which was in our time, during which the Lutherans have been fighting bitterly among themselves and have abandoned any hope of obtaining a consensus. What can be the reason for this great difference, except that they lack the ruler and guide, who alone can and must confirm all the brothers in the Faith, and preserve the whole Church in unity?

Finally, the same prophet adds this: *Of a sure foundation.* For, what is a sure foundation, unless it is a foundation on a foundation, a secondary foundation, not the first one? Surely we know that the first and principal foundation of the Church is Christ, about whom the Apostle says: *No other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus* (1 Cor. 3:11). Although the heretics boast about Christ, and claim that they follow his word and doctrine, nevertheless it is necessary, as the great Leo said in his letter to the Bishops of the province of Vienne, that whoever abandons unity with Peter will thereby be separated from the divine mystery.

Therefore, the See of Peter is a tested stone, a precious cornerstone, of a sure

foundation, and it is also for us; but for our heretical adversaries it is nothing other than a stone of offense, a rock of scandal. For since they should build themselves on it for a holy temple in the Lord they, on the contrary, as truly blind and mad agents work against it. For, it is displeasing to human wisdom, displeasing to their pride, who in their own eyes are prudent, that one mortal man, to whom they judge themselves not to be inferior either in erudition, or in probity, or for any other reason, is called the foundation of the Church, upon whom such a great, such a sublime, such an immense edifice is built. But this is displeasing to them, because they do not understand how it is for God not only easy, but also glorious to choose the weak in order to confound the strong. And they do not advert to the fact that this is God's way of doing things—that he leads us by Faith and humility to wisdom and glory.

Thus he surely decided to save believers by the foolishness of the preaching of the Cross; thus he chose fishermen to convert emperors; thus he tied to common and plain things like water, oil, bread and wine the power of the Sacraments and the infinite treasures of heavenly gifts, so that while by faith and humility we are dependent on common things, we may be raised to the lot of children of God and to participation in the divine nature itself. But they close their eyes to all of this, and do not cease to rave and rage furiously against the salutary rock and against the plan of God, so that it really is for them a stone of offense and a rock of scandal. For, long ago the Donatists called this See the seat of pestilence; Berengarius said that the pontiff of this See was "Pompifices and Pulpitices"; the Waldenses called him a purple harlot; John Wycliffe called the Roman See the synagogue of Satan; Lutherans, Calvinists and Anabaptists contend that it is he throne of the Antichrist. And since they disagree with us in many other things, still because of that they want to apply only one name to us. For, they call us nothing other than Papists, as if they think we err either only, or principally by defending the Supreme Pontiff. And they think that they cannot attack someone with a greater insult than if they call him a pope. Also eveiything in nature that is found to be dirty, disgraceful and detestable provided them with words to apply to the Pope.

Finally, this is the attitude towards the Pontiff of Luther and Calvin and their followers, that when they write bitingly and petulantly about all other things, when it comes to harassing the Supreme Pontiff, and burdening him with shameful deeds, calumnies and insults, they seem to be moved by madness, and to be full of an evil demon, or rather to cease being a man and to become a demon. Moreover, because they, whether they know it or not, are fragile and made of clay, but the Supreme Pontiff is a solid rock, when they fall on this rock they do not break it, but without doubt they are crushed by it: *He who falls on this stone will be broken to pieces; but when it falls on anyone, it will crush him* (Matt. 21:44). And St. Leo in the place cited above: *Whoever,* he said, *thinks he should deny the preeminence of this chair, can indeed in no way diminish its dignity, but being inflated with the spirit of his own pride, he plunges himself into the depths of hell.*

For, like a huge rocky crag, which rises in the middle of the sea above the waves and billows, is never broken down or moved, although repeatedly the blowing of the winds and the waves of the sea beat against it with great force, but rather it scatters and breaks all of them, so the See of Peter, as often as it attacked by Jews, Gentiles, heretics, rebels,

schismatics with incredible force, has stood unmoved for over 1500 years, while almost all of them have either wasted away or disappeared. And always (as St. Augustine says), as the heretics in vain shouted at her from all sides, she obtained the peak of her authority. Therefore you see, lest I am mistaken, the magnitude of this controversy, which has been proposed to us for an explanation.

Now I come to what we proposed in the second place. The first ones who seriously opposed the primacy of the Roman Pontiff seem to have been the Greeks. For they already in the year 381 wanted to make the Bishop of Constantinople, who before that time was not even a Patriarch, above the three Patriarchs of the East, and in the second place after the Roman Pontiff. This can be known from the fifth canon of general Council II. Then in the year 451 the Greeks, not content with that, tried to make the Bishop of Constantinople equal to the Roman Pontiff. For, in session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon the Greek Fathers define, not without some fraud and while the Roman Legates were absent, that the Bishop of Constantinople must be second after the Roman in such a way that he has equal privileges. And not being content even with this, during the time of St. Gregory and his predecessor Pelagius II, around the year 600, they began to call the Bishop of Constantinople, Oecumenicus, that is, the Bishop of the whole world. St. Gregory bears witness to this in his letters, many of which he wrote about this matter a short time later to the Emperor Mauritius, to the Empress Constantia, and to the other Patriarchs in the East.

Finally in the year 1054 they proclaimed openly that the Roman Pontiff, because of the addition of the word "Filioque" to the Constantinople Creed contrary to the decree of the Council of Ephesus which had forbidden any changes, had lost his position, and ths1 now the supreme and first of all the bishops is the pontiff of Constantinople. Sigbertu. records the history of this in the Chronicle, and elsewhere it is rather easily known from the letters of Leo IX. There is also a small book written in Greek by Nilo, the Archbishop of Thessalonica, against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, which Illyricus produced recently in Latin, from some source that I am not aware of.

Among the Latin authors, the first were the Waldenses, who removed themselves from obedience to the Roman Pontiff. The Waldenses made their appearance around the year 1170, as Reynerius reported, who lived about 300 years ago. Then in the year 1300, according to the testimony of Matthew Palmerio in the Chronicle, there arose a certain group who were called "Fraticelli"; besides other errors, they also embraced this one—that the authority of Peter in the Roman Church had ceased long ago, and had been transferred to the sect of the Fraticelli. On this see John of Turrecremata in book 4 on Ecclesiasticus (part 2, chapter 37). Not long after that, according to the same John of Turrecremata, there were Marsilius of Padua and John of Janduno, who made not only all Bishops, but also all priests equal to the Roman Pontiff.

Then about the year of the Lord 1390 John Wycliffe came on the scene, and John Hus followed him; their ideas against the apostolic See can be read in sessions 8 and 15 of the Council of Constance.

Finally, in our centuiy Martin Luther, and however many heretics appeared after him, have attempted to destroy the Roman pontificate with their whole strength and power of mind. And the summary of their teaching comes to this—that the Roman Pontiff at one

time was the pastor and preacher of the Roman Church, but just one among others, not above others; but now he is nothing other than the Antichrist. See Luther in his book on the power of the Pope and article 25 in his assertions, Philip Melanchthon (if he is really the author of the book) in the book on the power and primacy of the pope, or on the reign of the Antichrist written under the name of the Synod of Smalkald, John Calvin in book 4, chapter 6ff. of the Institutes, John Brentius in the confession of Wittenberg in the chapter on the Supreme Pontiff and the Prolegomena against Peter a Soto, Mathias Illyricus on Century 1 in book 2, chapter 7, col. 524ff. and chapter 10, col. 558ff. and successively the individual centuries, and chapter 7 likewise in the book on the primacy of the pope, and in another book on problems of the pope, and of Council VI of Carthage.

Now from all the nations many authors can be found who have written in defense of the authority of the Supreme Pontiff. But lest perhaps someone might say that he has been passed over, I confess that I am not going to mention all of them, but only those which I have been able to consult. We have one from Poland, but he can take the place of many, namely, Cardinal Hosius, with his explanation of the Creed in chapter 26, in book 2 against Brentius, and in his book on the authority of the Supreme Pontiff.

We have two from France: Remundus Rufius in his book against Charles Molina for the Supreme Pontiff, and Robert Arboricesnsis in volume 1 on the power of the two swords.

From Germany there are five: John Ecks in three books on the primacy of St. Peter; John Fabrus in refutation of Luther's book on the power of the pontiff; John Cochlaeus on the 4 Philippics; Gaspar Schatzergus on the Controversies; Conrad Clingius in book 3 on the common places.

From lower Germany there are six: John Driedonis in book 4, chapter 3, part 2 on Scripture and the dogmas of the Church; Albert Pighius in books 3, 4 and 5 on the hierarchy of the Church; John a Lovanio on the perpetual protection and steadfastness of the chair of Peter; Jacob Latonus in his book on the primacy of Peter; Gulielmus Lindanus in book 4 Panopliae; John Bunderius in compendium Concertum, title 31.

From England there are six: Thomas Waldensis in book 2, articles 1 and 3, on the doctrine of the Faith; John Roffensis in refutation of article 25; Cardinal Reginald Pole in his book on the Supreme Pontiff and in books 1 and 2 to King Henry VIII; Alanus Copus in Dialogue 1; Nicolas Sanderus in his book on a visible monarchy; Thomas Stapleton in the book of 6 Controversies.

From Spain there are seven: John of Turrecremata in book 2 on the Church; Alphonse de Castro in book 12 against the heretics; Melchior Cano in book 6 on places; Peter a Soto in defense of his confession, chapter 74 until the end; Francis Horantius in book 6 on Catholic places; Francis Turrianus in the book against Anthony Sadeetes. And Gregory de Valentia who recently also wrote about the same argument in his Analysis of the Catholic Faith, parts 7 and 8.

From Italy there are eight: St. Thomas in his Opusculum against the Greeks; St. Augustine in his summary on the power of the Pope; St. Anthony on III, q. 22 of the Summa of Theology of St. Thomas; Cajetan on the institution and authority of the Roman Pontiff; Gaspar Contarenus on the power of the Roman Pontiff; Thomas Campegius in

his book with the same title; John Anthony Delphinus in books 1 and 2 on the Church.

From Greece there is one: Gennadius Scholarius in his defense of chapter 5.

But in what pertains to the order and disposition, the proposed argumentation has two main parts: one on the institution of the supreme pontificate, or of the ecclesiastical monarchy; the other on the office and power of the Supreme Pontiff. And in the first part there are six questions.

First: Is monarchy the best form of government?

Second: Whether the government of the Church ought to be monarchical?

Third: Was St. Peter the first spiritual monarch of the Catholic Church?

Fourth: Whether St. Peter came to Rome, and there established the pontifical See which is to remain perpetually?

Fifth: Does the Roman Bishop succeed St. Peter, not only in the Roman episcopate, but also in the rule of the whole Church? Regarding this question certain other things are recalled, which are so joined with it that they can in no way be separated; such as, on hearing appeals from the whole world, on installing, confirming, transferring, punishing and also removing Bishops from their office, and some other matters of the same kind.

Sixth: Whether the same Roman Bishop changed at some time from being the Vicar of Christ to becoming the Antichrist.

Moreover, the second part of the Controversy embraces six other questions.

First: Is it the right of the Roman Pontiff to decide controversies concerning Faith and morals?

Second: Can he err in making that judgment?

Third: Can the Supreme Pontiff establish laws, which really bind the conscience of men, and also punish those who have abused their office?

Fourth: Whether ecclesiastical jurisdiction was committed by Christ to the Supreme Pontiff alone in such a way that only through him it can be conferred on others?

Fifth: Whether the same Pontiff, besides his spiritual jurisdiction, has some temporal power because he is the Pontiff?

Sixth: Whether he can have, and really does have, from the gift of princes, some temporal dominion in certain provinces or regions?

BOOK ONE

ON THE PRIMACY OF ST. PETER IN THE CHURCH MILITANT

CHAPTER I

THE QUESTION IS ASKED: WHAT IS THE BEST FORM OF GOVERNMENT?

No one can doubt that our Savior Jesus Christ wanted his Church to be governed in the way that is best of all and most useful. There are three good forms of government: Monarchy, that is, the rule of one man, and the contrary vice is a Tyrant; Aristocracy, that is, the rule of the best, to which is opposed an Oligarchy, that is, the rule of a few; and Democracy, that is, the rule of the whole people, which not rarely degenerates into rebellions.

The princes of philosophers teach this, like Plato in the Politics, and Aristotle in book 3, chapter 5 of the Politics and in book 8, chapter 10 of the Ethics, and they teach this not without a very good reason. For, if a multitude is to be governed, it cannot happen but that it will be governed in some way based on these three. For, one man will be in chaige of the state, or some taken from the many, or absolutely all. If one, it will be a Monarchy; if a few from the multitude, an Aristocracy; if absolutely all, a Democracy.

However, although there are only three forms of simple government, still these forms can be mixed together, and from this mixture four other mixed forms of government are produced. Рίκζ a combination of all three; second, monarchy and aristocracy together, third, a mixture of monarchy and democracy; fourth, a mixture of democracy and aristocracy. Given these several forms, the first question presents itself: which of these seven forms of government is the best?

Now John Calvin, in order to block absolutely all ways by which one is wont to arrive by argumentation at the establishment of the ecclesiastical monarchy, chooses aristocracy from the simple forms; but from the mixed forms, he prefers before all others the properly arranged rule of aristocracy and democracy. He says that the worst of all is monarchy, especially if it is in the whole world, or in the whole Church. His words from book 4, chapter 6 § 9 on the Institutes are these: *Surely it is true that they want something good and useful, the whole world to be united by a monarchy, however this is absurd but that is the way it is. But I will never concede that as the right way to govern the Church.* And in chapter 20 § 8: *Of course if the three forms of government, which the philosophers propose, are considered in themselves, I will surely not deny that either aristocracy or a mixed form of the state with democracy far exceeds all the other forms.* Then he adds two reasons: one derived from experience, the other from divine authority. *This,* he said, was *always proved by experience, and the Lord also confirmed it by his own authority, since he instituted an aristocracy among the Israelites as the form of government.*

But we, following St. Thomas and other Catholic theologians, from the three simple forms of government place monarchy before the others, although because of the corruption of human nature, we think that a monarchy at this time limited by aristocracy and democracy is more useful for men than a simple monarchy; provided, however, that the first place is given to monarchy, that aristocracy has the second place, and democracy is in the last place.

Now in order that this whole matter can more easily be explained and confirmed by arguments, we will prove our opinion with three propositions. The first proposition: of the simple forms monarchy is the best. The second: government composed of all three forms, because of the corruption of human nature, is more useful than a simple monarchy. The third: having set aside particular circumstances, the simple monarchy is simply and absolutely the best form.

CHAPTER II

THE FIRST PROPOSITION IS PROVED—THAT SIMPLE MONARCHY IS PREFERABLE TO SIMPLE ARISTOCRACY AND DEMOCRACY

Now we begin with the first proposition. In this place we are not comparing monarchy with the forms of mixed government, and we are not placing it before all the mixed and simple forms; but we are saying only this: if a simple form of government must necessarily be chosen, without doubt monarchy should be chosen. Now we will prove our point with these arguments.

First: all the ancient Hebrew, Greek and Latin authors are in agreement with this view, and also the theologians, philosophers, orators, historians and poets. Of the Hebrew theologians, Philo in his book on the confusion of languages, when praising the view of Homer, said this: *It is an evil for many to command, so let there be just one king; this pertains no more to cities and to men than it does to the world and God.*

Of the Greeks, St. Justin in his work on the sole government of God teaches that the rule of many is dangerous, and on the contrary, the rule of one is useful and salutary: *For the rule of one man,* he said, *is wont to be without wars and uprisings, and also free.* Also St. Athanasius in his oration against idols said: *For just as we said that a multitude of gods means the nothingness of the gods, so also it is necessary that a multitude of rulers has the effect that no one seems to be the ruler; and where there is no ruler, there complete confusion reigns.*

Of the Latins, St. Cyprian teaches the same thing. In his treatise on the vanity of idols he proves effectively that there is one God, because monarchy is the best and most natural form of government: *For the divine rule we will also borrow an example from the earth: how did the society of a kingdom ever begin with Faith, or cease to exist without a slaughter?* And St. Jerome in his letter to the monk Rusticus said: *There is one emperor; there is one judge of the province. Rome, when it was founded, could not have two brothers as kings.* Finally, see St. Thomas in I, q. 103, a. 3 and 4 *Contra Gentiles,* chapter 76.

Now from the philosophers: Plato in his *Politics,* near the middle, said: *One political authority supported by good laws is the best rule of all: but we should think that the form of government, in which not many command, is the second form; but the administration of many is a form that is weak and infirm in every way.* Aristotle followed Plato in book 8, chapter 10 in his *Ethics;* after he had enumerated the three forms of government, he added these words: *Of these the best is a kingdom, the worst is a republic.* Seneca in book 2 on Markus Brutus says that he did not act very prudently, when he killed Julius Caesar with the hope of liberty; and while offering the reason for this he says: *Since the best situation for a city is to be under the rule of a just king.*

Next, Plutarch wrote a whole booklet on Monarchy and the other forms of governing a multitude; in this booklet he states his opinion in this way: *If there is a choice of choosing a form, let him choose no other form but the power of one.* And again the same Plutarch in the essay on Solon, since he said that many uprisings took place in Athens,

when it was a democracy, then added immediately: *But one possibility seemed to remain to achieve public safety and quiet, if the whole matter were turned over to one ruler.*

Of the Orators, Isocrates, in the oration which he dedicated to Nicocles, strove to prove this same point with many reasons. But John Strobaeus in Sermon 45 under this title noted, ότι κάλλιστον ή μοναρχία, and in that sermon he produced the testimonies of Hesiod, Euripides, Serim, Ecphantis, and of many others in order to prove this point.

Herodotus in book 3 of his History, which is dedicated to Thalia, when he explained the carnage of the magicians, who controlled the kingdom of Persia, explained also the dispute which took place among the leaders about the establishment of a republic. The result of this dispute was that, after carefully examining the opinions of those who argued for an aristocracy or a democracy, by the consent of all with one exception, a monarchy was judged to be the most useful and excellent form of government, and because of this it is still retained in Persia.

Finally, from the poets. Homer in book 2 of the Iliad expresses the opinion praised by almost all the authors, όυκ άγαθον πολυκοιρανίη, είς κοίρανος έστω είς βασιλεύς. To this testimony of Homer, the only one out of many to object to it is Calvin, who said in book 4, chapter 6 § 8 of his Institutes: *The answer is easy: for it is not for this reason that monarchy is praised either by Homer s Ulysses or by others, as if one person should rule the whole world; but they want to indicate that a kingdom cannot have two rulers, and that power (as he says) does not tolerate a consort.*

Now certainly if it was easy for Calvin to respond, it will be even easier for us to refute his response. For, either he is saying nothing, or he is saying what we say, or he is saying something false and is contradicting himself. For if, when he says, one kingdom cannot stand two rulers, he is doing violence to the word "kingdom," and he wants to say that a kingdom in the proper sense does not have two rulers, because if there are two, it will not be a kingdom in the proper sense, because a kingdom really is under the supreme power of one man. Then he is saying absolutely nothing, but only with the ambiguity of words sheds confusion on the ignorant. For, to say in that way that a kingdom does not have two rulers, means the same thing as if one were to say—the kingdom of one is not the kingdom of two; and two men are not one man; to make such a statement the wisdom of Ulysses is not required.

Finally, if by a kingdom he wants it to mean not just any multitude, but one province, or one small kingdom, so that the meaning would be that for one province one king is sufficient, but that the same king does not have authority over the whole world—then he is also speaking falsely, and he is contradicting himself. For, Homer's Ulysses is not disputing about the establishment of a republic in some individual province, but he is speaking to the whole army of the Greeks, which at the time was at war against Troy; in that army there were many nations, many princes, also a few kings, and he is saying that all that multitude must not be ruled by many, but by one. Therefore the meaning of his famous saying cannot be anything other than that in any multitude there must be one primary leader; the same principle holds equally for a small kingdom, and in great empires; for, there should not be one king for a small kingdom, because that kingdom is small, but because it is one.

Therefore if any great kingdom, such as was that of Ninus, Cyrus, and also Alexander and Augustus is to be one, for it there must be only one prince, and since the Church is one it is said in Luke 1:33, *And of his kingdom there will be no end;* and there is Dan. 2:44: *And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed;* and because of that also it must be ruled by one man.

In addition Calvin is also fighting with himself, since he thinks that a monarchy is not useful not only in the whole world, but also in any one small city or Church, as is clearly deduced from book 4, chapter 41 § 6 in his Institutes, where he attributes all ecclesiastical authority to a group of elders; and from book 4, chapter, chapter 20 § 8, where he praises those cities which, having cast off the yoke of a king, are governed by a senate and the people, as is the case in the republic of Geneva. Therefore since Calvin leaves absolutely no place for a monarchy, it can be seen how well he responds to so many and such serious authors who praise the saying of Homer.

Another reason can be drawn from the divine authority, which shows in three ways that monarchy is the best form of government. The first is by the institution of the human race; for, God made the whole human race from one man, as the Apostle says in Acts 17:26; for, he did not produce the man and the woman from the dust of the ground in the same way, but the man from the dust and the woman from the man. When explaining the reason for this, St. John Chrysostom in homily 34 on 1 Cor. 13 says that the reason is that there would be among men not a democracy, but a kingdom. For, if several men at the same time were produced from the dust, they would all equally have to be princes over their own posterity. If that were the case, then we could rightly doubt whether the rule of one man would be pleasing to God. Now, however, since he made the whole human race from one man, and he wanted all to depend on that man, it seems to be quite clearly signified that he approves the rule of one man rather than the government of many.

Then God indicated his thinking, since he inserted not only in men, but in almost all things an inclination towards monarchical rule. And there cannot be any doubt but that this inclination must be referred to God, the author of nature. But that there is, besides the other forms of ruling, a very natural leadership of one, indicates above all that in eveiy home the government of spouse, children, servants and other things pertains to one master of the house; also that the greater part of the world is ruled by kings. Furthermore, it indicates that by far kingdoms are older than republics. *In the beginning* (Justin said in book 1), *the government of peoples and nations was in the hands of kings.*

Finally, it also points to the fact that irrational animals seem to demand the leadership of one. For, St. Cyprian says this in his treatise on the vanity of Idols: *The bees have one king, and in the flocks there is one leader, and in the herds one ruler.* St. Jerome adds the following in his letter to Rusticus: *And cranes follow one leader in perfect order.* Calvin ridicules this reasoning in book 4, chapter 6 § 8 in the Institutes: *In this matter,* he said, *if it pleases God, they take their proof from cranes and bees, which always choose for themselves one leader, not several. Now I accept the examples that they offer, but do the apes from the whole world come together to choose one king? The individual kings are content with their own beehives; so also among the cranes, each group has its own leader. But what else does that prove, except that each*

individual Church should have its own bishop?

Now it is easy to refute this answer of Calvin. For, the Church is like *one flock* (John 10:16), *not many flocks;* it can also be said to be like one beehive and one group of cranes. And just as there is one king for the bees, and as the cranes follow one leader in perfect order, so the universal Church must have and follow one leader and primary teacher. Then cranes and bees are not of such a nature that they can be joined together in mind with those that are absent and living at a distance, and so it is not surprising if they do not come together from the whole world to choose one king. But the fact that each small group has its own leader is sufficient evidence that the rule of one is natural.

Finally, if with these examples cited from the learned Fathers we can prove, as Calvin says, that the individual Churches should have their own bishops, why does he not allow for bishops, unless perhaps it is only because of the name, but in reality he attributes all ecclesiastical authority to one group of elders?

Now after having considered the points above, what form of government God wanted to confirm by his own authority can be gathered also and especially from the form of government that he established for the Hebrew people. For, as Calvin says and does not prove, the government of the Hebrews was not aristocratic, or like a republic, but it was clearly monarchical. The founders among the Hebrews were first of all the Patriarchs, like Abraham, Jacob, Judah and others; then the leaders like Moses and Joshua; then the judges like Samuel, Samson, and others; afterwards there were kings, like Saul, David, Solomon; finally again there were leaders like Zorobabel and the Maccabees.

The things done by them do indeed point out that the patriarchs were endowed with royal power. Abraham in Gen. 14 wages war against four kings. And we do not read that he received aristocratic authority from some senate; we find rather that he did not consult any senate. Judah in Gen. 38:24ff. condemned his daughter-in-law, who was accused of being a harlot, to be burned; he did not consult or ask permission from any senate. Moses in Exod. 32, as the true and supreme chief of the Jewish people, ordered many thousands of Jews, because of the golden calf which they had erected, to be killed on one day; and we do not read that he consulted a senate, or that a plebiscite preceded it. The same thing certainly can be said about the judges who, without any approval from a senate or popular vote, both waged war and decided who was to be killed. Certainly Gideon in Judges 8, after the victory over the Midianites, killed seventy men from the city of Succoth, and he destroyed the tower of Penuel.

Moreover, that the kings and the leaders of the Jews who followed them were endowed with great royal power is so evident that it does not need proof. Therefore let Calvin see where he reads that the state of the Jews was governed by aristocrats and the people and not by one chief leader.

But perhaps he will object with what we have in 1 Sam. 8, where the Israelites are rebuked by God because they begged to have a king. For, if it did not please God that a king should be established to govern the state, how credible is it that the leaders and judges appointed by God had royal power?

We respond that one person can preside over the whole state with supreme power in two ways: in one way, as a king and lord who depends on no one; in a second way, as a

substitute king or primary leader, who indeed presides over the whole people, but still is subject to another king.

God, therefore, during the time of the leaders and judges instituted the Jewish state in this second way, so that he himself would be the quasi proper and special king of that people; but since they were men, and needed a visible leader and someone to whom they could approach and make appeals, he placed a man over them as a substitute king, who in no way depended on the people under him, but on God who is the only true king. Hence God says to Samuel in 1 Sam. 8:7: *They have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them.* And the Apostle says this in Heb. 3:5: *Moses was faithful in all God's house as a servant.*

But because the Jews were not content with that state of the nation, they wanted to have a king in the first sense, who not only as one man commands all, which is what the leaders and judges had been doing, but also would possess the whole kingdom as his own property, and would hand it on to his own sons and nephews as an inheritance. Because of that they were rightly rebuked and reproved by the Lord. However, that desire of the people to have their own king did not displease God to the extent that he ordered them to have instead a polity or aristocracy; rather, he designated for them the best king, and afterwards he preserved and protected their king for as long as he remained in office.

The last reason follows, which is taken from the listing of those properties which all certainly agree pertain to the best kind of government. The first property is order. Where there is better government, there also is more order. But it can be demonstrated in the following way that monarchy is more orderly than an aristocracy or a democracy. All order consists in this that some men preside, and others are subject to them; for order is discerned not between equals, but between superiors and inferiors. But where there is a monarchy, there everything has a certain order, since there is no one who is not subject to another, with the exception of one person who has the care of all. For this reason, in the Catholic Church there is the greatest order, where the people are subject to pastors, pastors to bishops, bishops to metropolitans, metropolitans to primates, primates to the supreme pontiff, the supreme pontiff to God. But where the government is in the hands of aristocrats, the people have their own order, since they are subject to the aristocrats, but the aristocrats have no order among themselves. And much more does a democracy lack order, since all the citizens are on the same level, and they are thought to be the authority in the state.

A second property is the attainment of the proper end. And there can be no doubt but that the better form of governing a multitude is the one in which the proposed end is obtained more conveniently and more easily. The end or purpose of government is the unity of the citizens among themselves and peace; this unity seems to consist mainly in the fact that all think the same way, desire the same things, and follow the same leader. But this will be obtained much more certainly and easily, if one person is obeyed rather than many; for it can hardly happen that many, among whom one does not depend on another, will judge in the same way about the same things. Therefore, if there are many who rule a multitude, and one commands one thing, either he will not be obeyed, or the people will necessarily be divided into various groups. This is something that cannot

happen, when the power of commanding is in the hands of just one person.

Practice and the result of experience confirm this same point. Indeed among the Romans under the kings it is reported that dissensions among the citizens were very rare; when the kings had been removed, and through the years of the magistrate, it was ruled as a republic, and during that time it was a rare year in which the patricians did not fight with the people; and finally the civil disturbances increased so much that the powerful republic simply ceased to exist. Added to this is the fact that the city of Rome never experienced greater or more lasting peace than she did under the empire of Augustus, who was the first one to establish a stabile monarchy in Rome.

The third property is the strength and power of the State. For, by common judgment that form of government excels others which produces a stronger and more powerful State. But that State is stronger in which there is greater union and cooperation among the citizens; for, united powers are stronger than disconnected ones. But there is more unity where all depend on one rather than where they depend on many, as was proved above. Therefore, monarchy produces a stronger State, and so it is the best form of government.

This is confirmed by experience. Since of the four powerful empires, three of them grew to maturity under kings, namely, the empires of the Assyrians, Persians and Greeks; the Roman empire is the only one that grew under popular control, but even it in times of great danger could not be preserved without a dictator, that is, the installation of a temporary king. And afterwards it flourished much more under the monarch Augustus than it ever did during the time of the republic.

The fourth property is stability and durability. For it cannot be denied that the government is better which is more stable and more durable; nor can it be denied that monarchy is much more durable than an aristocracy or democracy, if one considers external forces; this was said already, when we showed that without doubt it is stronger than the other forms.

Now it remains to be proved that, when no external force is a threat, a monarchy is less exposed to dissensions and changes than any other form of government. This is proved from this: *Every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste,* as Christ says in Matt. 12:25; but it is more difficult for a monarchy to be divided than it is for any other form of government. For, what is more one, is less easily divided; but what is simply one is more one than a multitude working together as one. For the former is per se one, and naturally, and it is nothing other than one; but the latter is one only as put together, but per se and naturally it is many. Monarchy, therefore, which depends on one person, can be less easily divided and destroyed than an aristocracy or democracy, which depends on a multitude working together.

Hence indeed the monarchy of the Assyrians from Nino to Sardanapalus lasted without interruption for 1240 years, as Eusebius says in the Chronicle; or 1300 as Justin says in book 1, or more than 1400 as Diodorus says in book 2, chapter 7. This kingdom lasted so long, because always the successor in the kingdom was the son of the dead king, if it is true what Velleius Paterculus in the first volume of his histories.

Then there is the kingdom of the Scythians, which is considered the oldest of all, and could not be destroyed by any external enemy, as Justin writes in book 2, and it has

never at any time been dissolved. Therefore, that kingdom has been in existence for some thousands of years, and there is no republic that has been durable and stable like that.

Certainly the powerful republic of the Romans could last scarcely 480 years; that is the number of years from the kings to the mastery of Julius Caesar. But under the monarchs of the East from Julius to the last Constantine it continued without interruption for 1495 years, but in the West from the same Julius until Augustulus more than 500 years; and from Charlemagne until the present emperor about 800 years. But in those 480 years, during which democracy flourished in the Roman government, the republic was not always ruled in the same way. For, in the beginning, annual consuls were created; shortly after that tribunes were added. Then when the consuls and tribunes were done away with, the rule of ten men was created. When they were removed after a year, the consuls and tribunes were established again; not rarely also dictators, and sometimes military tribunes with consular power were introduced. Therefore, no one form lasted for a long time, and all of them together were not able to achieve the age of the noble kingdoms.

Perhaps they will raise and objection concerning the republic of Venice, which lasted more than 1100 years. But even it did not meet the years of the kingdom of the Scythians or of the Assyrians, indeed not even that of the Franks. Moreover, the republic of Venice is not an aristocracy mixed with democracy, a form that Calvin praises, but it is an aristocracy mixed with monarchy; and in that city there is no room for democracy.

The fifth and last property is facility of government. For, it is very important that it be easy and not difficult for the city to be governed well. But that it is easier for a city to be governed rightly by one person than by many can be proved with the following reasons.

First: it is easier to find one good man than it is to find many. Then the people will more easily obey one man rather than many. Moreover, magistrates, who rule the republic alternately and for a brief time, often are forced to care for a province before they know fully the needs of the republic. A king, however, who always performs the same office, although at times he may be a man of less talent, still from practice and experience he is better than many others. Likewise, annual magistrates look upon the affairs of the republic as something foreign, because they are not their own but are common property. But a king looks upon them as his own. And it is certain that he will more easily and more diligently take care of what is his own, rather than what belongs to others. In addition, where there are many who rule, it can hardly happen that in that situation envy, ambition and rivalry will be lacking. Because of this it happens not rarely that some hinder others, and bring it about that those who are now in control administer the republic badly, so that while they are in charge they will receive more glory. But a monarch, who does not have anyone to envy, or with whom he contends over the government, can direct all things more easily.

Finally, as in large families, where the same duties are assigned to many servants, affairs are managed in a negligent manner, because one leaves the common work to another, so also when there are many leaders of a republic, one looks at another, and while each one pushed any burden off onto his colleagues, no one has sufficiently diligent care for the city. A king, however, who knows that everything depends on himself, is forced to neglect nothing. And so it has been demonstrated that a simple monarchy surpasses by far a simple aristocracy. Now we will begin to prove the second proposition.

CHAPTER III

THAT MONARCHY MIXED WITH ARISTOCRACY AND DEMOCRACY IS MORE BENEFICIAL IN THIS LIFE THAN SIMPLE MONARCHY

Therefore the second proposition was this: A government composed of all three forms, because of the corruption of human nature, is more beneficial than a simple monarchy. This type of government requires that there be in the republic a supreme ruler, who both commands all others and is himself subject to no one. However, the directors of the provinces or cities are not vicars of the king, or annual judges, but true princes who obey the commands of the supreme leader, and govern their province or city not as belonging to someone else, but as their own. Thus there is place in a republic both for a certain royal monarchy and the aristocracy of excellent governors.

But if to this is added that neither the supreme king nor the local governors acquire their dignities by hereditary succession, but each one is elected to his dignity by all the people, then the place in the republic for democracy is provided for. That this is the best and the most desirable form of government in this mortal life we will prove with two arguments.

First, this type of government would have all those good properties, which we proved above are to be found in a monarchy; and in this life it would be more pleasing and beneficial. It is clear that the benefits of monarchy are present in this kind of govemmenζ since it really and truly includes a certain kind of monarchy; and that it will be more pleasing to all is seen from the fact that all prefer that type of government in which they can take part. Such is our proposal when it is carried out in the proper way.

Concerning the benefits there is no problem with what we say, since it is certain that one man cannot by himself govern the individual provinces and cities, and willy-nilly he is forced to entrust their care either to his own vicarious administrators or to their own leaders. And again it is equally certain that the leaders will take care of their own matters much more carefully and faithfully than they will as representing someone else.

There is another argument from divine authority. For, God instituted in his Church, in both the Old and New Testaments, the type of government which we have already described. And concerning the Old Testament it can easily be proved that the Hebrew people always had either one leader, or judge, or king, who commanded the whole multitude, and this pertains to a monarchy. Moreover, it also had many minor leaders, about whom we read this in Exod. 18:25: *Moses chose able men out of all Israel, and made them heads over the people, rulers of thousands, of hundreds, of fifties, and of tens. And they judged the people at all times.* But that pertains to an aristocracy. Finally, these leaders were taken from gill the people, not from just one tribe, as this is easily seen from Exod. 18 and Deut. 1, and this in a certain way is a form of democracy.

Concerning the Church of the New Testament, the same thing will be proved later, namely, that in it there is the monarchy of the Supreme Pontiff, and the aristocracy of the bishops (who are true leaders and pastors, and not vicars of the Supreme Pontiff), and finally that there is a certain place also for democracy, since there is no man in the whole Christian community who cannot be called to the episcopacy, if he is judged to be worthy of this office.

CHAPTER IV

INDEPENDENTLY OF THE CIRCUMSTANCES, SIMPLE MONARCHY IS ABSOLUTELY AND SIMPLY THE BEST FORM

The third proposition is this: independently of the circumstances, simple monarchy absolutely and simply excels all other forms of governing. For, if among men we place a mixed government before simple monarchy because one man cannot be present in all places, and he is necessarily forced to provide for the affairs of state through his own ministers or through local princes, certainly because of this and other circumstances of the person, there will be no reason why a simple monarchy is not preferable to the other forms of government.

Furthermore, we have another more powerful argument. Since simple monarchy is the norm in the dominion of God and Christ, and everything that is best must be attributed to God and Christ, then it is necessary that a simple monarchy is the best form of government. And if someone wishes to deny that, I do not see how he does not fall into the error of Marcion and the Manicheans, and also the Gentiles. For, since the world is governed in the best way by its creator, and without controversy; if aristocracy is the best form of government, there will be many rulers of this world, and what follows from that—many creators, many primary directors, many Gods.

Therefore the ancient Fathers St. Cyprian in his Tractate on the vanity of Idols, St Justin in his exhortatory Oration, St. Athanasius in his Oration against Idols, to these also can be added Philo the Jew in his book on the confusion of languages, prove that there is one God, who directs and governs all created things, with this powerful argument because monarchy is the best form of government. For this reason Justin and Philo left for posterity books written about the monarchy of God.

That being the case, the error of Calvin cannot be excused; for, blinded by hatred of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, he prefers aristocracy to all other forms of governing, even if it is considered per se and setting aside all circumstances. For, these are his words in book 4, chapter 20 § 6 in the Institutes: *And if you compare the states among themselves independently of the circumstances, it will not be easy to discern, which one excels in usefulness, so far as they contend under equal conditions.* And somewhat after that: *Indeed if in themselves those three forms of government are considered, which the philosophers propose, I will in no way deny that either aristocracy, or a state composed of it and democracy, by far excels all other forms.* These are his words.

But you will say, read what follows, and you will find the answer to your objection. So Calvin goes on to say: *Indeed it is not something per se, but because it happens very rarely, that kings so control themselves that their will never disagrees with what is just and right: then it is rare that they are endowed with such understanding and prudence that each one sees what is sufficient. Therefore the imperfection and defects of men are the reason why it is safer and more tolerable to have many in charge of the government*

I hear him, but what happened to the edition of 1554, where those words do not appear? But, you will say, having been warned he corrected the error later. I omit the

fact that in such a teacher in Israel it was not to be tolerated that he should ever fail so seriously; I am amazed at this, that Calvin could not correct that error, unless he was in conflict with himself. For if, as he says, it is not easy to discern which form of the state excels, also if they are compared with each other independently of the circumstances; and if while in themselves the three forms of government, which the philosophers propose, are considered, the aristocratic form of government is said to excel; how can it be true that he adds immediately: *Indeed it is not something per se, etc.* And: *Therefore the imperfections and defects of men are the reason why it is safer and more tolerable to have many in charge of the government.* For, unless I am mistaken, those things are contradictory: *If in themselves those three forms are considered, aristocracy excels.* And: *Indeed it is not something per se, but because it happens very rarely that kings do not disagree with what is right.*

These statement are no less contradictory: *It cannot be discerned which state excels, if they are considered independently of circumstance.* And then: *The defects of men are the reason why aristocracy is judged to be more safe.* For, setting aside the imperfection of men, and having removed all other circumstances, monarchy either excels or it does not. If it excels, why will it be true that it cannot be discerned which State is better, if they are compared with each other independently of the circumstances? If it does not excel, why do we defend the monarchy of God against the Manicheans and the Gentiles? Now we will move on to the second question.

CHAPTER V

HERE IS THE SECOND QUESTION: SHOULD THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH BE MONARCHIC?

Since it has been demonstrated that monarchy is the best form of government, there arises a second question: Whether monarchic government is fitting for the Church of Christ. And so that we can separate the certain from the doubtful, it is to be noted that the adversaries agree with us on three points. One is, that in the Church there is some form of government, for in Cant. 6:4 it is said: *Terrible as an army with banners.* Acts 20:28: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of the Lord.* Heb. 13:17: *Obey your leaders.*

The second point is that the government of the Church is spiritual and distinct from politics; for, when Paul said: *He who contributes in liberality* (Rom. 12:8). And: *Let the elders who rule well be honored worthy of double honor* (1 Tim. 5:17), and there are similar statements: there were not yet any, or certainly very few secular leaders in the Church, which is something that Calvin also teaches in book 4, chapter 11 § 1 in his Institutes.

The third point is that the absolute king of the whole Church is Christ alone, about whom it is said in Ps. 2:6: Z *have set my king on Zion, my holy hill.* And Luke 1:33: *And of his kingdom there will be no end.* Therefore in the Church an absolute and free monarchy, or aristocracy, or democracy is not sought, but a form that can be that of servants and stewards, since Paul says in 1 Cor. 4:1: *This is how one should regard us, as servants of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God.*

Now the adversaries think that the ecclesiastical government committed to men by Christ is in no way monarchic, but aristocratic and democratic, although they are not in agreement among themselves. For, Illyricus in book 2, chapter 7 of Centuries 1 teaches that there is no one in the Church who presides over all, but that the total ecclesiastical authority is in both the ministers and the people. However, in a book on the choice of bishops he attributes the supreme authority to the whole multitude of the Church, and he thinks that democracy in the Church comes in the first place and aristocracy in the second place, that is, the assembly of the elders. Calvin on the other hand in book 4, chapter 11 § 6 in his Institutes attributes supreme ecclesiastical authority to the assembly of the elders, over whom he wants a bishop to preside, like a consul for the senate. And in the same place he openly teaches that the authority of the assembly of the elders is greater than that of the bishop. Calvin does grant some authority to the people, but less than that to the assembly of the elders. Additionally, John Brentius, in the prolegomena against Peter a Soto, concedes the supreme power to the aristocrats; however, he does not want them to be bishops, but secular leaders, whom he contends are the most noble members of the Church.

Now all Catholic doctors agree on this point, that the ecclesiastical government committed to men by God is indeed monarchic, but qualified, as we said above, by aristocracy and democracy. This point is treated specially also by St. Thomas in 4 Contra

Gentiles 76, John de Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 2 on the Church, and Nicolas Sanderus in books on the visible monarchy of the Church. Singling out traces of this, we will propose four propositions, and we will defend them as best we can. The first will be that the government of the Church is not in the hands of the people. Secondly, it is not in the hands of secular princes. Thirdly, it is not really in the hands of ecclesiastical officials. Fourthly, it is in the hands of one supreme présider and priest of the whole Church.

CHAPTER VI

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH IS NOT DEMOCRATIC

Therefore the first proposition, which denies that the government of the Church is popular, can be confirmed with these arguments. First, from the four things which must be present in all popular government.

First. Where there is a popular government, the magistrates are constituted by the people themselves, and they get their authority from the same; for, when the people per se cannot make judicial decisions, they must at least establish others, who can act in their name. Accordingly, Markus Tullius at the beginning of 2 Agr. Consulatum, who was the supreme magistrate in the Roman Republic, invokes the good will of the people; and in the same place he says that they were accustomed to create the consuls by a vote of the people.

Second. Where there is a popular government, in grave matters an appeal is made from the decision of the magistrate to the judgment of the people; Livy in books 2 and 4 says that that was a custom in the Roman republic, and Plutarch in his essay on Solon says the same thing took place in the Athenian republic

Third. The laws by which the republic is to be governed are proposed by the magistrate, but they are commanded by the people, as is known for certain from Livy in book 3. The same thing can be known from the Oration of Cicero on the law of Manilius and on the law Agr. delivered to the Roman people.

Fourth. The magistrates are wont to be accused before the people, and to be deprived of their dignity, and to be sent into exile, and also to be put to death, if that was the will of the people, and there are many examples of this. For, the Romans from the first two consuls whom they created, only because of the hateful name of the Tarquinians, deprived Tarquinius Collatinus of his office of magistrate before his time was up, as Livy reports in book 2. And when the same Romans had created the Ten Men as leaders, later they deposed them against their will, according to Livy in book 2.

Now it is very easy to demonstrate that none of these things are suitable for the Christian people. Regarding the first point, it is sufficiently certain that in the whole Bible there is not one word, whereby authority is given to the people to create bishops or priests; but there is testimony whereby such authority is given to bishops, as in Tit 1:5: *This is why I left you in Crete.,, that you might appoint elders in every town as I directed you.* Then the Apostles, who were the first ministers of the Church, were chosen and established by Christ, as we read, and not by the Church (Mark 6:7ffi). Also the first bishops after the Apostles, at a time when the Church was very holy, were installed by the Apostles, which can be known also from the history of the Magdeburgenses. For, the Centuriatorians say in book 2, chapter, 12, col. 15 in Centuries 1 that pastors were given by Paul to Iconium and Antioch, and in chapter 10, col. 624 they teach from Nauclerus and other historians that bishops were installed by St. Peter—Apollinaris at Ravenna, Maternus at Treves, and Hermogenes at Aquileia.

St. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 3 says that Linus was made bishop of Rome by

Peter and Paul. Tertullian in his book on prescription writes that Clement was made the bishop of Rome by Peter, and Polycarp at Smyrna by John. Eusebius in book 3, chapter 4 of his history says that Timothy was installed as bishop of Ephesus by Paul, and Titus on Crete. Nicephorus in book 2, chapter 41 writes that Plato was made bishop by the Apostle Matthew in a certain town of the Cannibals, which was called Mirmena. Leo writes in letter 81 to Doscorus that St. Mark was created a bishop by St. Peter and sent to Alexandria. It is gathered also from Eusebius in book 3, chapter 4 of his history that Dionysius the Areopagite was made bishop of the Athenians by Paul and Bede clearly states the same thing in the martyrology. If it were necessary, we could show the same thing about many others. Accordingly, it is sufficiently evident that in the first and very holy Church there was no place for democracy, since the Apostles, not the people, constituted the ecclesiastical magisterium.

And what is said about an appeal to the people is not fitting for the Christian community. For, nowhere is it heard of in the Church that an appeal is made from the bishop to the people, or that the people absolved those whom the bishop had bound, or bound those whom the bishop had absolved. Also it never happened that the people passed judgment on the controversies concerning the Faith; and we can quote many judgments of bishops, and especially of the Sovereign Pontiff, which are found in the Acts of the Councils. But the adversaries cannot adduce even one judgment of the people.

You can add to this that there are innumerable testimonies of Scripture, the Councils and the Fathers that it is in no way fitting for the Christian people to exercise ecclesiastical judgment. We prove this partly in the question about an ecclesiastical judge, and partly in the questions about the Councils. But certainly if some kind of popular authority was thriving in the Church, it would be astonishing that in the past 1500 years nothing was ever decided by the people.

Next, the third point about passing laws is also not fitting for the people. For, all the laws of the Church are found to have been introduced by Pontiffs or by Councils, and the approval of the people has never been sought, that from their approval the laws might be thought to have authority. Hence in Acts 15:41, when Paul is going through Syria and Cilicia, he ordered the people to obey the precepts of the Apostles and elders. But there is no law in the Church, which could be said to be a plebiscite, like the many laws that exist in the republic of the Romans.

Finally, the last point about judging magistrates is the most unsuitable of all. For, no bishop can be named who was ever deposed or excommunicated by the people, while there are many who have been deposed or excommunicated by the supreme pontiffs and the general Councils. Certainly Nestorius was deposed from the episcopate of Constantinople by the Council of Ephesus at the command of Pope Celestine, according to Evagrius in book 1, chapter 4, and Dioscorus was deprived of the episcopacy of Alexandria by the Council of Chalcedon because of a decree of St. Leo; this is clear from session 3 of the Council and this is the first reason.

Another reason is taken from the wisdom of God. For, it is not credible that Christ, the wisest of kings, established in his Church that form of government which is the worst of all; but democratic rule is the worst of all, as Plato teaches in Axiocho: *Who could be*

happy, he said, *living under the authority of the crowd, even if it is favored with gifts and praised, etc.* Aristotle in book 8, chapter 10 of his Ethics says that of the three forms of governing a multitude monarchy is the best and democracy the worst. Plutarch in his essay on Solon mentions that Anacharsides, a Scythian, was amazed that in Greece the wise speak and the fools judge, that is, because the orators speak and the people judge. Likewise, in the Apophthegm he says that Lycurgus, when asked why Sparta had not introduced democracy, responded to the interrogator that he should first introduce it into his own home.

Among our own authors, St. Ambrose in book 5, chapter 21 of the Hexameron said about the multitude of the people: *It does not weigh the merits of virtue, nor does it seek the advantages of public utility, but it is in a state of constant change.* Jerome in his comments on Matt. 21 said: *The crowd is always changeable, nor does it persist in a proposed choice, and in its moral judgment it is driven this way and that way by the force of different winds.*

St. Chrysostom in homily 2 on John defines the people as something full of confusion and disturbance, and for the most part driven by foolishness, casually undulating like the waves of the sea, often moved by different and conflicting opinions; then he adds: *Therefore anyone who is under its control—is he not surely the most miserable of all?* There is also another reason. For, that form of government must be the worst, where the wise are ruled by the foolish, the experienced by the inexperienced, the good by the bad; but that is what the democratic form of government is. For, where democracy is in power, everything is determined by the vote of the majority; but it is certain that there are always more foolish persons than wise, bad than good, inexperienced than experienced.

In addition, if, as Aristotle teaches in book 1, chapters 1 and 3 in the Politics, those who have talent naturally are in charge of those who are dull; and as St. Augustine says in chapter 12 in his book on the profit of believing: *Foolish men will live better if they can be servants of the wise,* then who does not see what great disturbance of order there is, if the government of the republic is entrusted to the multitude of disorderly people?

Finally, if the people had some authority in the government of the Church, it would have it either from itself, or from another; but it is not from itself, because this power is not from the law of nature or of the nations, but from the divine and supernatural law. For, it is not like the civil authority, which is in the people unless it has been handed over by the people to a prince. Also, the people do not have it from another; for it must have it from God, if it has it from another; but it does not have it from God, since in the book of God, that is, in the Holy Scriptures nowhere is the power of teaching, feeding, ruling, binding, loosing given to the people, but the people are always called the flock, which must be shepherded. But to Peter it is said: *Feed my sheep* (John 21:17). *The Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God* (Acts 20:28). Therefore we have the reality that there is no popular government of the Church. But there are three arguments against this proposition. The first one is taken from the words in Matt. 18:17, *Tell it to the Church,* where it seems that the supreme tribunal of the Church has been placed in the hands of all the faithful.

We respond that the expression "tell it to the Church" means, *bring it to the public*

tribunal of the Church, that is, to those who function as the public person of the Church. For, this is how Chiysostom explains "tell it to the Church," that is, to the présider. Surely the praxis of the Church confirms this; for, we have never seen, or heard, that anyone pleaded a criminal case before the multitude of the people; but we have often seen, often heard that someone pleaded his case before the bishop.

Another argument is taken from chapters 1 and 6 of the Acts of the Apostles. For, in Acts 1 the whole Church elected Mathias; and in Acts 6 the same Church elected seven deacons; and the Fathers passim teach that the election of bishops pertains to the people.

We respond that we will consider the election of ministers in another place. But in the meantime we deny that from the right, which at one time the people had in the choice of ministers, ecclesiastical democracy can be proved in any way. This is so because the people never ordained or created ministers, nor did they confer on them any power, but they only nominated and designated, or as the Ancients say, proposed those whom they wanted to be ordained by the bishops through the imposition of hands. Therefore in Act 6:3 the Apostles say: *Pick out from among you seven men of good repute... whom we may appoint to this duty.* There they only grant to the people that they seek out and propose some suitable men for that task; but the Apostles, not the people, ordained the proposed men as deacons. Cyprian also in book 3, letter 9 teaches this: *The Lord,* he said, *chose the Apostles, and the Apostles by themselves constituted the deacons.*

Furthermore, when the people truly create bishops, the ecclesiastical government does not immediately become especially democratic. For, that it be a democratic government, it is required that the people constitute the magistrates, but many other things are required; and that by itself is not per se sufficient. For, the first kings were elected by the people, however their rule is monarchic, and not democratic.

Similarly, the Roman Emperors formerly were chosen by the soldiers, and now they are chosen by certain princes; and still the dominion pertains to monarchy, not to democracy; for, in order for it to be a democracy, it would be necessary that, once the king had been chosen, there would still be more authority in the people than in the king, and one could appeal from a decision of the king to the judgment of the people. That does not exist in the Church, just as it does not exist in the kingdom and empire of the Romans. Valentinianus senior understanding this, as Sozomenus reports in book 6, chapter 6, when the soldiers wanted to give him a partner in office, said to them: *It was in your power to choose me as the emperor; but since I have already been chosen by you, the partner in the office whom you are demanding, is no longer in your power, but the choice to do that is now in my power alone.*

They seek a third argument from the authority of Saints Cyprian and Ambrose. Cyprian in book 3, letter 14, when writing to priests and deacons about some restless brothers, said: *Meanwhile they are to be prevented from pleading their case either before us or before the whole people.* Ambrose in letter 32, when dealing with a judgment of Faith, said: *Now the people themselves have judged.* Likewise: *Auxentius,* he *saxà, flees from your investigation.*

I respond that St. Cyprian was accustomed to handle all major affairs in the presence of the clergy and people, and to do nothing without their consent. Moreover, he did this

on his own initiative, not being forced by any law, as is evident in book 3, letter 10, where he says: *When I decided at the beginning of my episcopacy not to carry out my own private opinions without consulting you, and without the consent of the people, etc.* But because of that Cyprian was not subject to the clergy or the people; it was like the case of King Ahasuerus with the wise men with whom he took counsel, as we read in Esther 1:13ff., and when Cyprian had subjected himself willingly to the clergy and people, it is not at all credible that he immediately prescribed some law for the whole Church.

But in what pertains to Ambrose, in that place Ambrose is speaking about a private judgment, whereby each person decided what was to be done, not about a public decision which has the power of binding others. This can be seen from the words of the same Ambrose, because in the same place he says this: *If there are some let them come simply to the Church, let them listen with the people, not so that each acts like a judge, but so that each one may examine his own heart and choose whom he wishes to follow.* See more objections that they can raise on this point in book 1 on the Councils, chapters 19 and 20.

CHAPTER VII

ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY IS NOT UNDER THE CONTROL OF SECULAR PRINCES

Another proposition, which denies that ecclesiastical authority pertains to secular princes, is directed against two errors of Brentius. The first error of Brentius is that the secular princes are the aristocrats of the Church; and Brentius so demotes bishops that he wants them to be servants of the princes. The second error is that the care and government of the Church pertains especially to these aristocrats. Henry VIII, the King of England, also embraced these errors. For he set himself up as the head of the English Church, and in the same way he thought that other princes should be the supreme heads of the Church in their own domains.

Now it is easy to refute the first error. First, from the prophetic words in Ps. 45:16: *Instead of your fathers shall be your sons; you will make them princes in all the earth.*

St. Augustine explains this text in the following way: "instead of your fathers," that is, the Apostles, sons have been born, that is, many faithful Christians, whom God has established as bishops, and therefore princes in all the earth. And St. Jerome on the same place said: *O Church, the Apostles were your fathers, because they begot you, but now because they have left the world, you have for them the bishops as sons.* And after that: *Princes of the Church, that is, the bishops were constituted.* And the Greek Fathers do not explain it much differently—Chrysostom and Theodoretus explain that the fathers are the patriarchs; by sons they understand the princes to be the Apostles. Similarly, the Apostle in 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 4:11 said: *God has appointed in the Church first Apostles, second prophets, third teachers.*

If the Apostles are first, who were bishops and whom the bishops succeed, certainly kings and secular princes are not first; indeed, as Damascene rightly pointed out in Oration 2 on images, the Apostle not only did not place kings in the first place, he did not give them any place, in order to indicate that kings are not magistrates of the Church, but only of earthly kingdoms.

Secondly, it is refuted from the Fathers. Ignatius in his letter 7 to Smyrna says that there is nothing more honorable than a bishop in the Church; and he adds that the first honor is due to God, the second to the Bishop, the third to the King. Nazianzen in his Oration to citizens struck with fear, Chrysostom in book 3 on the priesthood and in homily 4 on Isa. 6, and Ambrose in chapter 2 of his book on the dignity of priests openly place the bishop before the king.

Then also Chrysostom in homily 83 on Matt, places kings not only below bishops, but also deacons; for, this is how he speaks to his deacon: *If any leader,* he said, *if a consul, if he who is adorned with a diadem, approaches unworthily, hinder and restrain him; you have more authority than he has.* Augustine on Ps. 99 proves that Moses was a priest because Moses was the most powerful, and no one is more powerful than a priest. And Gelasius in a letter to Anastasius said: *You know, kind son, that although you preside over the human race concerning the dignity of earthly things, still as a faithful Christian you are subject to the presiders over divine things.* And

after that he added: *You know that you must be subject in religious matters and not preside. Therefore, you know that you depend on their judgment, and that they cannot be subject to your will.*

Gregory in book 13, chapter 19 in his treatise on Morality says that the first members in the Body of the Lord are the priests. And in book 4, letter 31 to Mauritius he teaches that priests are something like Gods among men, and on that account are to be honored by all, even by kings; Nicolas I teaches and proves the same thing in his letter to Michaelis.

Thirdly, it is refuted from the deeds of bishops and kings. For, Pope Fabian excluded Philippus, the first Christian Emperor, from communion of the Sacrament of the altar on Easter Sunday, because of his public sins. And he did not admit him until he had removed his sins by confession and penance. Eusebius writes about this in book 6, chapter 25 of his History. Similarly, Constantine openly confessed that he could not pass judgment on the bishops, since they are like Gods; on the contrary, he said that he stood subject to their judgment; Ruffinus writes about this in book 1, chapter 2 of his History.

St. Ambrose expelled Theodosius the Elder from the confines of the Church, and forced him to submit to a public penance; and then, when the Emperor went to the place in the Church for priests and wanted to sit there, Ambrose ordered him to remove himself and to sit with the people, and he did that willingly; Theodoretus writes about this in book 5, chapter 17 of his History.

Finally, the Emperor Maximus, when he was seated at a banquet, and St. Martin was also there, the cup-bearer wanted to offer the first cup to the Emperor, as being the most noble of all; however, he sent it to the bishop, who did not refuse it but drank first, and then he did not give the cup to the Emperor, but to the priest with him; thus he thought that no one was more worthy to drink after himself; hence he did not prefer the king or his assistants to the priest, as Sulpitius writes in his life of St. Martin.

The same error can be refuted for two reasons. First, a bishop anoints the king, he teaches, he binds, he absolves, he blesses; and the Apostle says in Heb. 7:7: *It is beyond dispute that the inferior is blessed by the superior.*

Furthermore, secular rule was instituted by men, and it is the rule of the nations; ecclesiastical rule is from God alone, and it is of divine right. The former governs men, as they are men, and more because of the body than the soul; but the latter governs men, as they are Christians, and more because of the soul than the body. The former has for its purpose temporal peace and the well-being of the people; the latter is for eternal life and happiness; the former uses natural laws and human methods; the latter divine laws and sacraments divinely instituted; the former wages war with a few visible enemies; the latter with invisible and infinite enemies.

But on the other hand Brentius objects: Bishops are servants of the Church as stated in 2 Cor. 4:5: *What we preach is not ourselves, but Jesus Christ as Lord, with ourselves as servants for Jesus 'sake.* Therefore, how much more will they be servants of kings, especially since St. Peter says about kings in 1 Pet. 2:13-14: *Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human institution, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, or*

to governors sent by him.

I respond that there are two kinds of service. For, all who work for the advantage of another are said to serve him; but some work and serve another by governing him, and by presiding over him; some work and serve by being obedient and performing their duties, and these are servants in the proper sense. Bishops are servants of the Church, but in the prior way, just as also a magistrate serves the republic, and a king serves the people (if he is a king, not a tyrant), a father his sons and a teacher his pupils.

Therefore St. Paul in 1 Cor. 4:15 says that he is the father of those for whom he had said he is their servant: *I became your father in Christ Jesus through the Gospel.* And then he adds: *What do you wish? Shall I come to you with a rod, or with love in a spirit of gentleness?* And in Heb. 13:17: *Obey your leaders and submit to them.* And in Acts 20:28: *The Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God.* For this reason St. Gregory called himself the servant of the servants of the Lord. And St. Augustine in book 19, chapter 13 of his *Confessions* said: *Inspire, O Lord, your servants my brothers, your sons my masters, whom I serve with heart and voice and pen.* And St. Bernard in book 2 on contemplation says that Eugene, when he had been made Pontiff, was raised above nations and kingdoms, but in order to serve, not to dominate.

But, you may say, kings are kings even in the Church, and Christians should be subject to them, *as to those who are more distinguished.* That is indeed true, but only in those matters that pertain to the realm of politics. For, Christian kings govern Christian men, not as Christians, but because they are men, just as also sometimes they govern Jew and Turks, but they do it in a political way. For, as Christians they are the sheep subject to the bishops who are the shepherds, as Nazianzen teaches in his Oration to the citizens struck with fear, and as St. Ambrose in his Oration on handing over the instruments. Basil says that nothing can be said to be more honorable than that the Emperor is called a son of the Church; for a good Emperor is in the Church not over the Church.

The second error of Brentius is easily refuted from what has just been said. For if the leaders are not the best men in the Church, then the aristocracy of the Church does not pertain to them. But the following arguments also can be added.

First. The government of the Church is supernatural; therefore it does not belong to anyone except to the one to whom God commits it. But we read in the Scriptures that it was committed to the Apostles and to their successors. For, it was said to the Apostle Peter: *Feed my sheep* (John 21:17), and about the bishops it is said in Acts 20:28: *The Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God.* Nowhere do we read anything of this kind about kings.

Then for almost 300 years there was no secular leader in the Church, with the sole exception of the Emperor Philippus, who lived for a very short time; and perhaps there was someone else in the provinces not subject to the Roman Emperor; nevertheless that was the same Church we now have, and it had the same form of government, and secular princes did not govern the Church of Christ.

Likewise, those who have supreme power in the State can do everything that the

subordinate officials can do. For, who could stop a king, if he wanted to know and judge for himself certain cases, which he had committed to lower governors, and officials, and judges? But kings cannot usurp for themselves the office of bishop, priest and deacon, which consists in preaching the word of God, baptizing and consecrating, etc. Therefore kings are not the supreme magistrates of the Church.

Now that kings cannot take over the duties of priests we prove in the following way. First of all, kings can be not only men, but also women; but the Apostle forbids women to teach publicly in 1 Cor. 14:35 and 1 Tim. 2:12; and the Pepuzitae are said to be among the heretics by Epiphanius in Heresies 49 and Augustine in Heresies 27, because they conferred the priesthood on women.

Then in 2 Chron. 19:11 Jehoshaphat, a good king, said: *Amariah the chief priest is over you in all matters of the Lord; and Zebediah will be over all the kings matters.* And in 2 Chron. 26:18 when Uzziah the king wanted to burn incense in adoration, the high priest forbade him, saying: *it is not for you, Uzziah, to burn incense to the Lord.* And when he persevered, immediately he was struck by God with a severe leprosy. But if in the Old Testament the king could not fulfill the office of priests, much less is that so in the New Testament, where the sacerdotal offices are much more sublime.

Likewise in the Synod of Matisco in canon 9, in the Council of Mileum in canon 19, and in Toledo III in canon 13 the clerics are severely punished who brought a Church problem to a secular judge. And Ambrose in a letter to his sister says that he said to Valentinianus: *Do not, O Emperor, lay on yourself the burden of such a thought as that you have any imperial power over those things which belong to God.* Likewise, the same Ambrose said to the Emperor Theodosius: *The purple of emperors does not constitute them priests.* Theodoretus recounts this in book 5, chapter 18 of his History, and he also writes in book 4, chapter 18 that a certain Eulogius, when Modestus, a governor under the Arian Emperor Valens, said to him, *Join together with the Emperor,* he answered wittily saying: *Has he also joined together the priesthood with the empire?*

Athanasius also in a letter on the solitary life reprimands Constantius because he had involved himself in ecclesiastical matters, and he adds that Hosius, the bishop of Cordoba, had said to the same Constantius: *Do not give us commands of this kind, but rather learn some things from us: for, God committed to you the empire, but he entrusted to us things pertaining to the Church.* Svidas in the life of the bishop Leontius says that he said similar things to Constantius. Sulpitius in book 2, near the end of his sacred history reports that St. Martin said to the Emperor that it is a new and unheard of crime that a secular judge should pass judgment on a matter of the Church.

St. Augustine in letters 48, 50 and 165 teaches that it is the duty of devout kings to defend the Church, and to punish with severe laws and punishments blasphemers, heretics and those guilty of sacrilege who have been condemned by the Church. And in the same place he reprehends the Donatists, because they referred an episcopal case not to his brother bishops, but to an earthly judge for judgment. St. Gregory in book 5, letter 125, when speaking about the Emperor Mauritius, said: *It is well known that devout lords love discipline, and maintain order, honor the canons, and do not immerse themselves in priestly affairs.* John Damascene teaches the same thing at length in

Orations 1 and 2 on sacred images. Finally, the emperor Basil in the eighth Council said clearly that it is not allowed for himself or for any lay persons to handle priestly affairs; Sozomenus testifies in book 6, chapter 7 that Valentinianus the Elder also confessed the same thing.

The arguments of Brentius are taken from Old Testament examples, where we read that Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Josiah, who were leaders and kings, often involved themselves in matters of religion. Brentius also adds for the confirmation of his argument, that the protection of the divine law was entrusted by God to the kings, and therefore that the care of the Church pertains to them. For, thus the Apostle says in Rom. 13:4: *He does not bear the sword in vain. He is the servant of God to execute his wrath on the wrongdoer.*

We respond that Moses not only was the leader, but he was also the high priest, as was demonstrated in the question about the judgment of the controversies in book 3 on the Word of God; and that there were others who sometimes did things with extraordinary authority, not only as kings, but also as prophets. But not on account of that should the law in Deuteronomy be denied, whereby ordinarily in the case of religious doubts men were sent not to the king, but to a priest from the tribe of Levi (Deut. 17:9). Therefore, as we said above, king Uzziah was punished with leprosy, because he assumed for himself the office of priest.

Now we will respond to his confirmation that kings should be the protectors of the divine laws, but not the interpreters; for their function is to hinder with laws and punishments blasphemies, heresies, sacrileges. But what the heresies are, and on the other hand, what the orthodox Faith is they must leam from the bishops, which is what the devout emperors did, like Constantine, Valentinianus, Gratian, Theodosius and Martianus.

CHAPTER VIII

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH IS NOT PRINCIPALLY IN THE HANDS OF THE BISHOPS

The third proposition follows, which teaches that the government of the Church is not principally in the hands of bishops and priests, contrary to two errors of Calvin. The first error is that bishops and priests by divine right are equal. The second one is that the supreme authority of the Church resides in the assembly of the elders. This was the error of John Hus, as can be understood from articles 27,28 and 29 which were condemned at the Council of Constance in session 15.

The first error will be refuted more fittingly in the argument which we will give, in its proper place, about the clergy. It will be sufficient for now to refute this error from the second one, since these two errors are in conflict with each other. For if the Church is governed by the best men, that is, by the assembly of elders, or among those elders only the bishops are included, who are truly the best men of the Church, or the priests are also included: if only the bishops are included, it follows, that the priests are not equal to the bishops, and that they are not the best men, and then the first error of Calvin is refuted; if priests are included, it follows that the Church is not governed by the best men, as by the assembly of elders which was Calvin's second error. For, it is certain that in the general Councils, in which the administration of the whole Church is dealt with, and where the laws, by which the Church is ruled, are passed or abrogated, priests with the authority of defining were never included, unless they were present as legates, and they took the place of some bishops. It is not necessary to prove this other than by referring to the acts of the Council, which are still in existence.

Now the second error, which belongs in this context, is refuted by these reasons. First, nowhere in the Scriptures do we read that supreme power was conferred on a Council of priests; for, whatever authority was granted by Christ to the Apostles and the other disciples, was granted not only to all, but also to single persons. And in order to exercise it there was no need for a Council; for doubtless the individual Apostles could, and also now the individual bishops can teach, baptize, loose, bind, ordain ministers, etc. There is only the text in Matt. 18:20 where something is conceded to a Council, when it is said: *Where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I in the midst of them.*

But here it is not explained, what the power of the Council is, whether it is supreme, or middling, or on the lowest level. And Calvin himself, the main one against whom we are arguing, in book 4, chapter 9 § 2 in his Institutes does not lay much stress on this text of Matthew, so that he says that he does not accept anything from these particular Councils, but only from the general Councils. Therefore, there is no reason at the present time to belabor this point.

Secondly, if the supreme authority of the Church were under the control of the best men, it would follow that the Church almost always would lack leaders, and for the most part that there would be no one to provide for the common good; therefore the ecclesiastical government would be the worst of all. For, the best men, since they are all equal, cannot take care of the common good in a suitable way, unless they either meet

together, or by common consent elect a magistrate whom all must obey, as the Romans elected their consuls.

But in the Church the best men rarely gather together in a general Council. For, during the first 300 years there was no general Council; afterwards there was hardly one every hundred years. And those best men never did create a magistrate whom the whole Church would obey at least for a time. For, if they had created one, he surely would have been one of the first five Patriarchs, who always stood out in the Church before others. But the adversaries contend that the Roman Patriarch never had this power; and it is certain that the other four did not have it. For, the Patriarch of Alexandria never had any authority outside Egypt, nor did the others outside their regions.

Accordingly St. Jerome in his letter to Pammachus against John, the Bishop of Jerusalem said: *Please answer me: what has Palestine to do with the Bishop of Alexandria?* And Chrysostom in his first letter to Innocent I makes a serious inquiry about Theophilus, the Patriarch of Alexandria, who involved himself in ecclesiastical affairs outside his own province: *For it is not right,* he said, *that those who are in Egypt should judge those who are in Thrace.*

Who does not see how absurd it is that the Catholic Church, which is so much one that in Scripture it is called one city, one house, one body, has no one on earth who cares for it and directs it? For, if the particular Churches were not so tied together that they constitute one body, their own leader would suffice for each one. But they can no more lack one head or leader, than can one flock lack its own shepherd, and one body its own head.

Thirdly, if the supreme authority were in an assembly of the best men, then the larger the Council is the more authority it would have. And so it could never happen that a small Council would have more authority than a large one.

But the Council of Ariminum composed of 600 bishops, in the Catholic Church has never been thought to have any authority. But the first Council of Constantinople composed of 150 bishops has always had the greatest authority. But we Catholics give the reason for this, namely, that the first one was reproved by the Sovereign Pontiff in whom there is the supreme authority of the Church, while the latter was confirmed by him. But those who attributed the supreme authority to the best men cannot give any reason why they reject the Council of Ariminum, but embrace Constantinople. But, they say, the Council of Ariminum erred, and Constantinople did not err; therefore we accept the latter and reject the former. But what is this except to make oneself the judge of Councils and of the whole Church?

Fourthly, although democracy absolutely is the worst kind of government, still aristocracy seems to be even more pernicious for the Church. Indeed, heresy is the greatest evil for the Church, but heresies are promoted by the best men rather than by the common people. Certainly almost all the heresiarchs were either bishops or priests; therefore certain heresies are as it were factions of the best men, without which there would be no popular rebellions in the Church. However, factions never develop more easily and more frequently than when the aristocrats rule, which can be proved not only from experience, and from the testimony of philosophers but also from the admission of

Calvin himself in book 4, chapter 20 § 8 in his Institutes.

But there are three testimonies of Scripture, together with three from the Fathers, which are raised as objections. The first is in Acts 15:6 where we read that the first controversy that arose in the Church was handled not by a supreme judge, but by a council of Apostles and elders: *The Apostles,* Luke said, *and the elders were gathered together to consider this matter.*

I respond that from this event no argument can be drawn in favor of aristocracy. Indeed, in that meeting the first question was decided, where the présider and head was Peter; for, Peter, being in another diocese, since bishop James was present, would not have dared to speak first, unless he was the head of the whole Council. And it is not opposed to monarchy that something is decided in a public meeting with the common advice and consent of the members, as is usually done at this time in meetings conducted by the Emperor.

The second testimony is from Acts 20:28, where St. Paul admonishes the bishops with these words: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God.*

The third is in 1 Pet. 5:1-2, where Peter says this: *I exhort the elders among you, as a fellow elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ... tend the flock of God that is in your charge.*

I respond that nothing is proved from either of these texts. For we do not deny that bishops and priests work together to feed and guide the Church of God. But our question is about the supreme power of the whole Church: Is it located in a group of ministers, or is it in one man? In these texts neither Paul nor Peter touch on this question, but they only admonish bishops to carry our faithfully their pastoral office regarding their own people.

Now from the Fathers, in the first place they cite Cyprian, who in book 3, letter 19 wrote the following to his priests: *Since these things concern the advice and consent of all of us, I make only a preliminary judgment, but I do not dare to decide the whole matter by myself* I respond that Cyprian did not dare to do that because willingly he had already put a limit on himself, when he assumed the bishopric, that he would do nothing without the counsel and consent of the clergy and people, as we learned above from his letter 10 in book 3.

Next they cite Ambrose who, in his Commentary on 1 Tim. 5, said this: *Both the synagogue, and later the Church had elders, without whose counsel nothing was done.* I respond that ecclesiastical aristocracy from these words can no more be proved than it is proved from a senate and royal council that there is no monarchy in a kingdom. For, certainly Solomon in 1 Kings 12:6 had a group of elders whom he could consult; and Ahasuerus in Esther 1:13ff. used the council of the wise men in all matters; but that does not mean that they were not kings. Moreover, the early bishops did nothing useful or salutary without the counsel of the elders, but that was not necessary; and also from that it can be known that, at the time of Ambrose, such a thing did not take place, and nevertheless the Church did not perish completely.

Finally, they cite Jerome, who says in his comments on Tit. 1: *Before at the prompting of the devil there were studies in religion, and it was said among the people: I belong*

lo Paul, I belong to Apollos, and I belong to Cephas, they were governed by a common council of the elders of the Church. But afterwards each one thought that those whom he had baptized were his and not Christ's, so it was decreed for the whole world that one elected from the elders should be placed over the others; so all the care of the Church was given to him, and the seeds of schisms were done away with. Therefore, during the first time of the Church, when it was very holy, aristocracy thrived, and the elders were the best men or aristocrats.

I respond: St. Jerome seems to have held that the bishops, if there is a question about jurisdiction, are indeed above priests, but only by ecclesiastical law, not by divine law—and this opinion is false and it will be refuted in its proper place. In the meantime, however, this view does not help the aristocracy of Calvin's elders, but on the contrary it hinders it in a special way. For, Jerome is not saying that in the first Church the aristocracy of the best men was flourishing, and was a good form of government, and gradually afterwards through some abuse monarchy was introduced by some bad men; rather, he says that the aristocracy, which existed at the beginning, because it did not work well, and because of it there arose several seditions and schisms, by the common consent of the whole world was changed into monarchy.

And there cannot be any doubt that Jerome thought this change was made during the time of the Apostles, and by the authority of the Apostles themselves. For, in this place he says that the change was made at the time when it began to be said: *I belong to Paul, I belong to Apollos;* Paul says that this took place in his time in 1 Cor. 1:12. Then Jerome in his book on illustrious men, in the essay on James, says that James immediately after the passion of the Lord was made the Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles, and in his letter to Evagrius, which is number 85, he says that St. Mark was made the Bishop of Alexandria.

In addition, Jerome is not speaking about the government of the whole Church, but only of particular Churches, since he says, at first the Churches began to be governed by the common deliberation of the elders. For, elsewhere, he says that Peter was established by Christ as the head of the whole Church, and Jerome also teaches the same thing in book 1 against Jovinian: *From the twelve one is chosen, so that, having been established as head, the favorable opportunity for schisms might be removed.*

CHAPTER IX

ECCLESIASTICAL GOVERNMENT CHIEFLY SHOULD BE MONARCHIC

Finally, there is the last proposition, which says that the government of the Church chiefly should be monarchic. And first of all the reason whereby it can be proved can be deduced from what has already been said. For, if there are three forms of government—Monarchy, Aristocracy, Democracy, and if it has already been proved that the government of the Church should not be democratic or aristocratic, then the only remaining possibility is that it be monarchic. Then, if monarchy is the best form of government, as we said above, and it is certain that the Church of God having been established by its very wise founder, Christ, is to be governed in the best way: who can deny that its government must be monarchic?

But Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 9 in his Institutes steps forward and denies, if monarchy is the best form of government, that it therefore follows that the Church should be ruled by one man, since it is certain that her king and monarch is Christ himself.

But this is easily refuted, since although Christ is the one and proper king and monarch of the Catholic Church, and rules and directs her spiritually and invisibly, nevertheless the Church, which is corporal and visible, needs one visible, supreme judge, by whom disputes concerning the religion can be resolved, and who confirms all the lower leaders in their office and in unity. Otherwise not only the Sovereign Pontiff, but also bishops, priests, teachers and ministers would be superfluous, for Christ is our Shepherd—*he is the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls* (1 Pet. 2:25). He is the only teacher, and the heavenly Father commands us to listen to him (Matt. 17:5). It is he, *who baptizes in the Holy Spirit* (John 1:33).

Therefore, just as bishops, teachers and other ministers are not superfluous, although what they do as ministers Christ does principally, so also he is not to be done away with who, as the supreme overseer, takes care of the Church, although Christ principally provides that care for the Church.

The second reason is taken from the similitude that the Church of mortal men has with the Church of immortal angels. St. Gregory in book 4, letter 52 also makes use of this reason. Indeed, it is certain that the latter is the exemplar of the former, and more or less its idea, as the Apostle seems to indicate in Heb. 8 and St. Bernard clearly says in book 3 of his treatise on Consideration to Eugene, where he says that the Church militant is called in the book of Revelation, *the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven,* because it was established according to the example of that heavenly city and is in conformity with it.

It is not less certain that, among the angels, besides God who is the sovereign king of all, there is one angel who presides over all the others. But at the beginning the one who had this dignity was the one who now is called the devil; those who bear witness to this are Tertullian in book 2 against Marcion, Gregoiy in homily 34 on the Gospel and in book 32, chapter 24 of his Morality, Bede in comments on Job 40, and Isidore in book 1, chapter 12 on the supreme good; it can also be deduced from Job 40:15, where

Behemoth, that is, the devil, is said to be the beginning of the ways of the Lord, and from Isa. 14:12ff., where he is compared with Lucifer, that is, the largest and most beautiful of the stars, at least according to its appearance and the opinion of the common people, to which the Scriptures are wont to accommodate themselves. Jerome and Cyril in their comments on this place teach that this Lucifer is the devil, and Augustine says the same in book 11, chapter 15 of *The City of God.* And then there is Ezek. 28:13, where it is said: *Every precious stone was your covering;* and immediately nine precious stones are listed, whereby are signified, as Gregory explains in book 32, chapter 25 of his Morality, the nine choirs of angels, who surrounded this angel as their leader.

But after the fall of the devil, it is gathered from Rev. 12:7 that St. Michael is the prince of all the angels, where it is said: *Michael and his angels.* For what does this mean, *Michael and his angels,* except Michael and his army? For, since it is said in the same place "the devil and his angels," we understand that all the bad angels are subject to the devil, like soldiers to the Emperor; so when it is said "Michael and his angels" we should understand this to mean that all the good angels acknowledge Michael as their leader; therefore rightly in the Church's Divine Office St. Michael is presented as the overseer of paradise, and he is called the prince of the heavenly army.

Calvin says in book 4, chapter 6 § 10 in his Institutes that one should speak very carefully about heavenly things, and that one should not seek another type of the Church except what is stated expressly in the Gospel and in the letters of the holy Apostles. It is as if he is not speaking prudently, who says nothing from his own head, but follows the Apostle and the holy Fathers.

The third reason is taken from the Church of the Old Testament. For, it is certain that the Old Testament was a figure of the New, as the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 10:6: *Now these things are warnings for us.* But during the time of the Old Testament there was always one man who was over all in the things that pertained to the Law and religion. This is so especially from the time in which the Hebrews began to be formed as a people, and to be governed by laws and magistrates after their departure from Egypt. For then Moses organized the nation of the Jews, wrote laws for them which he had received from God, consecrated Aaron high priest, and made all the priests and Levites subject to him alone. And then until the time of Christ there was never lacking one high priest, who governed all the synagogues of the whole world; this can be easily proved, if it is not conceded by the adversaries. For, this is what the Magdeburgenses say in Centuries 1, book 1, chapter 7, col. 257: *In the Church of the Jewish people, by divine law there was one high priest, whom all were bound to acknowledge and to obey.* Calvin confesses the same thing in book 4, chapter 6 § 2 in his Institutes.

Therefore, since the Church of that time was a figure or type of the Church of this time, reason surely demands that, just as the former, besides the invisible God as ruler, also had a visible ruler, so also the latter has the same, since no perfection should be found in the figure, which is not found even more perfectly in the exemplar.

John Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 in his Institutes gives two answers to this argument. The first is that there is no comparison between the small number of the Jewish people and the Christians in the whole world. *For the one people of the Jews,* he said, *beset with*

idolaters all around them, had to have one supreme ruler, who would maintain unity lest they be drawn away by the different religions. But it is absurd to want to establish one ruler for the Christian people spread out in the whole world. And he adds a similitude. *Just as,* he said, *the whole world should not be put under the control of one man, because one field is cultivated by one man.*

But it seems to me that this first answer does not really solve the problem, but rather makes our argument more and more convincing. For, if the reason why the Jewish people had one leader was, as Calvin says, to keep them unified, and not go over to the idolaters who surrounded them, the Church of Christians should have one head for a greater reason. For, one head is required more there where it is more difficult to maintain unity, and where there is more danger lest the people be drawn apart by different religions. But it is more difficult to maintain unity in a large multitude them in a small group, and there is more danger where there are many enemies of the Faith than where there are fewer. But the Christian people are much larger than the Jewish people ever were, and Christians have more enemies, since they are attacked not only by Turks, Tartars, Moors, Jews, and other infidels, but they are also troubled by innumerable sects of heretics. Therefore, it is more difficult to maintain unity among Christians, and a greater danger threatens them from the enemies of religion than was the case formerly with the Jews; so if unity is not preserved, the danger becomes more threatening.

The reason Calvin gives for attributing one head to the Jewish people applies even more to the Christian people. And his similitude about the field misses the point; for we do not desire that one leader by himself should rule the whole Christian world, as one farmer by himself cultivates one field; but we commit the government of the whole Christian world to one supreme pastor in such a way that he rules through many lesser pastors, just as one rich head of a family cultivates many fields with the help of many farmers, and one king administers many cities and provinces through many governors and royal officials.

Then Calvin offers another answer and says that Aaron represented the figure not of the pontiff of the New Testament, but of Christ; therefore since Christ has already fulfilled that figure in himself, the pope cannot claim anything from it for himself.

In response to that we urge not so much the figure of Aaron as that of the whole Old Testament. For since the Old Testament is a figure or type of the New, just as in the Old there was a monarchic government, so we also say there should be one in the New. Moreover, I add that Aaron himself not only was a type of Christ, but also of Peter and his successors; for, just as the sacrifices of the old Law signified the sacrifice of the Cross, and at the same time were types of the sacrifice which is now offered in the Church, so the high priest of the Old Testament represented both Christ the high priest, and at the same time he was a type of the priesthood, which we now see in the Church; for the reason for the sacrifice and the priesthood is the same.

Perhaps they will deny that the old sacrifices signified the passion of Christ and at the same time our oblation, but that is what Augustine teaches in book 20, chapter 18 against Faustus: *The Hebrews,* he said, *in the animal victims, which they offered to God in many different ways, as was worthy for such a great reality, were celebrating a prophecy of a*

future victim, which Christ offered. Hence now Christians celebrate the memorial of his completed sacrifice by a holy oblation and participation in the body and blood of the Lord. And in book 1, chapter 18 against the adversaries of the law and the prophets he said: *The faithful know all this in the sacrifice of the Church, and all the former sacrifices were foreshadows of this one.* And in book 3, chapter 19 on Baptism: *The Lord himself sent those whom he had cleansed from leprosy to the same holy place that they offer to the priests a sacrifice for themselves, because the sacrifice was not yet available to them, which he wanted to be celebrated later in the Church for all of them, which he was announcing beforehand to all of them.*

And there is no other reason why St. Gregory in his book on pastoral rule, part 2, chapter 4, interprets everything that is said about the clothing and adornments of Aaron to be referring to the virtues, which are required in Christian pontiffs. And Cyprian in book 1, letter 7 explains about our priests the things that are said in the Old Testament about the Aaronic priests, which all the other Fathers frequently do, that the new priesthood succeeds the old priesthood, and the Christian pontiffs succeed the Jewish pontiffs, as their types and foreshadows.

The fourth reason is sought in those likenesses by which the Church is described in Scripture. For, all of them show that in the Church there must be one head. The Church is compared *to an army set in order* (Song 6:4); to the human body or *a beautiful woman* (Song 7); *to a kingdom* (Dan. 2:44); *a sheepfold* (John 10); *a household* (1 Tim. 3:5); *a ship or the Noah's ark (*1 Pet. 3). Now there are no well-arranged armies or camps where there is not one emperor, many tribunes, several centurions, etc. Jerome in his letter to Rusticus said: *In any large army the command of one man is expected.* Therefore, how can the Church be an organized army, if all the bishops, and all the priests are on the same level; similarly, in every human body there is only one head.

And perhaps you will say: the Church has Christ as her own head; because of that in this place we are not comparing the Church with Christ, like the members with the head, but as the bride with the bridegroom. Scripture uses this likeness in Rev. 21:2, 1. Cor. 11:3, Eph. 5:32, and in the Song of Songs frequently. And really if the Church which is on earth, excluding Christ, is not ineptly compared to a bride; also excluding Christ, it must have one head, especially since among the other members the head is also mentioned clearly in Song 7: *Your head,* said the bridegroom to the bride, *crowns you like Carmel.* And the bride says about the bridegroom: *His head is the finest gold* (Song 5:11). And the bridegroom indeed compares the head of the bride to Mount Carmel, since although the high priest is a high mountain, still he is nothing other than earth, that is, a man. But the bride compares the head of her spouse to the finest gold, because God is the head of Christ.

Now was there ever a kingdom which was not ruled by one person? And even though Christ is the king of the Church, still from that we conclude that the Church must have, besides Christ, one man by whom it is governed, because kingdoms are always administered by a king, that is, by one man who presides over all; and if the king is present, he does it by himself; if he is absent, by another who is said to represent the king. Also, often when the king is present, some vicar general actually runs things.

But that he requires one flock and one shepherd is seen clearly in the Gospel: *There shall be one flock,* the Lord said in John 10:16, *and one shepherd.* There it is to be noted in passing that the phrase "and one shepherd" can be understood to refer to a secondary shepherd, that is, to Peter and his successors. For, when the Lord says, *I have other sheep that are not of this fold,* he is speaking about the Gentiles and the Jews; but he is teaching that he has among the Gentiles many elect, who either are already believers, or certainly will be in the future, and still they do not belong to the Jewish people.

However, if the concern is with the shepherd as God, the Jewish people and the Gentiles were always one flock, and the one God their shepherd; but they were not always one flock and one shepherd with respect to human government; for, the Gentiles, or those among them who belonged to the Church, were not ruled by the high priest of the Jews. But Christ wanted after his coming to make one flock out of both peoples, and he wanted all men to be governed by one human shepherd. Hence Cyprian in book 1, letter 6 to Magnus, speaking about Novatian, who wanted to become the bishop of Rome, although Cornelius had already been elected and was functioning there, said the following: *Therefore when the Lord insisted on our unity coming from the divine authority, he says: I and the Father are one; in order to bring his Church to this unity, he says finally: And there shall be one flock and one shepherd. But if there is one flock, how can one who is not among the number of the flock be counted with the flock? Or how can one be considered a shepherd, who, while remaining a shepherd, and in the Church of God where there is presiding with a successive ordination, succeeds no one, and beginning from himself, is a stranger and not consecrated?*

Then there is the example of the home and the ship. Surely every home has one Lord and one housekeeper, according to Luke 12:42: *Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his master will set over his household?* These words are said to Peter, and about Peter; for just before that when the Lord had said, *Blessed are those servants whom the Lord finds awake when he come,* Peter asked him: *Lord, are you telling this parable for us or for all?* And the Lord said to Peter: *Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his master will set over his household?* It is as if he were to say: Peter, above all I am speaking to you; for, you must consider what is required in a faithful and prudent householder, whom the Lord establishes over his household.

And right after that, to show that he is speaking about someone who is over his fellow servants, and is subject only to his master, he adds: *But if that servant says to himself, "My master is delayed in coming," and begins to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and drink and to get drunk, the master of that servant will come on a day when he does not expect him and at an hour he does not know, and will punish him, and put him with the unfaithful.* With these words the Lord clearly indicates that he will put one servant in charge of his whole household, who can be judged by himself alone. Chrysostom brilliantly explains this text to be about Peter and his successors in book 2, near the beginning, of his treatise on the priesthood. Ambrose agrees with this, or whoever is the author of the Commentary on 1 Tim. 3: *The house of God,* he said, *is the Church, whose master today is Damasus.*

Finally, regarding the ship, Jerome said in his letter to Rusticus: *On a ship there is*

one captain; and Cyprian in book 1, letter *6,* after he said that Noah's ark was a type of the Church, therefrom proves that Novatian could not become the captain of the ark, because Cornelius had already been given that role, and one ship requires one captain, not several.

The fifth reason is taken from the beginning of the government of the Church. For it is certain that the Church founded by Christ began initially to have a visible and external government that was monarchic, not aristocratic or democratic. For Christ, when he lived on earth, visibly directed it as its supreme shepherd and ruler, as the Magdeburgenses also admit in Centuries 1, book 1, chapter 7, col. 268ff. Therefore now the Church must also have an external and visible monarchic government, otherwise the Church that now exists would not be the same city of God as that one. For, as the philosopher teaches in book 3, chapter 2 in his Politics, a city is said to be the same specifically as long as the same form of city politics remains, that is, the same common form of government; if it changes, then also the nature of the city changes.

The sixth reason is taken from resemblance. In individual places individual bishops are rightly installed, and they are over all the other ministers and pastors of that place; even Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 7 in the Institutes admits this with these words: *What else do they prove except that the individual Churches should have their own bishops?*

Also in the individual provinces individual metropolitans are rightly established, who preside over the bishops of their province; and in the larger cities there are primates or patriarchs who, as St. Leo says in a letter to Anastasius, the archbishop of Thessalonica, assume a much larger role in the Church (Calvin has not dared to deny this; for he says this in chapter 4 § 4 in his Institutes: *That the individual provinces have one archbishop among the bishops; likewise, that in the Council of Nicaea patriarchs were established, who are superior in order and dignity to archbishops—all of that pertained to the preservation of discipline).* Therefore, it is right that there should be one man who presides over the whole Church, and to whom the primates and patriarchs are subject. For, if monarchic authority is suitable for one city, for one province, for one nation, why not also for the whole Church? Does this reason demand that the parts be ruled monarchically, but the whole aristocratically?

Then by these reasons it is proved that one bishop should preside over the parish priests, an archbishop over the bishops, a patriarch over the archbishops; so by the same reasons it can be proved that there must be one sovereign pontiff over the patriarchs. Why is one bishop necessary in individual Churches, unless it is because one city cannot be well governed except by one person? But also there is one universal Church. Similarly, why is one archbishop required, unless it is so that the bishops are held together in unity, that their disputes can be resolved, that they can be assembled together in a Synod, that they be forced to perform their duties? But for the same reasons one man is required who presides over all the archbishops and primates.

Calvin will respond that the bishops over the priests, the archbishops over the other bishops, and the primate over them are greater in honor and dignity, but not in authority and power. That is what he teaches in book 4, chapter 4 § 2 in his Institutes.

But certainly his is mistaken and he deceives others. For (and I omit others) in 1

Tim. 5:19 when the Apostle says, *Never admit any charge against an elder except on the advice of two or three witnesses,* he makes the bishop the judge of the elders, but there is no judge without authority. Moreover, in the Council of Antioch in canon 16 it is decreed that, if a priest or deacon has been condemned by his own bishop and deprived of honor, and then approaches another bishop, in no way should he be accepted. Therefore, a bishop can condemn an elder, and deprive him of honor—and this certainly is an exercise of power and jurisdiction.

Likewise, in the third Council of Carthage, in chapter 45, the Fathers say that the primate has the power to accept clerics from any diocese and to ordain them bishops, where it is necessary, even against the will of the bishop to whom that cleric is subject. Do we not here see clearly that a primate has more power than the other bishops? Finally, Leo in the letter to Anastasius of Thessalonica, which is number 84, and Gregory in book 4, letter 52 openly teach that not all bishops are equal in authority, but that some are truly subject to others; hence St. Leo rightly concludes that authority over the whole Church pertains to the one See of Peter.

The seventh reason can be taken from the propagation of the Church. For, the Church always grew and must grow, until the Gospel has been preached in the whole world, as is clear from Matt. 24:14: *This gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world... and then the end will come.* But that cannot take place, unless there is one supreme head of the Church, who has the responsibility of preserving and propagating the whole body. For, no one should preach, unless he is sent according to Rom. 10:15: *How can men preach unless they are sent?* It is not the role of particular bishops to send preachers into other provinces. For they have the definite limits of their own diocese, outside of which they do not have authority, and what pertains to them is the care of the flock assigned to them.

Therefore, in the histories of the Magdeburgenses we hardly find any Church established after the time of the Apostles by others, except by those whom the Roman Pontiffs sent to do the work of God. St. Boniface, sent by Pope Gregory II, converted the Germans. St. Kilian, sent by Pope Conone, converted the Franks. Augustine was sent to England by Pope Gregory I. Innocent I in letter 4 stressed that Churches were founded throughout Spain, Gaul and Africa by those whom Peter or his successors sent to do this work.

The eighth reason is taken from the unity of the Faith. For, it is necessaiy that all the faithful think exactly the same way in matters of Faith: *For there is one God, one faith, one baptism* (Eph. 4:5); but there cannot be one Faith in the Church, if there is not one supreme judge whom all are bound to follow. Certainly the dissent among Lutherans teaches this quite clearly; for, they disagree among themselves, because they do not have one person, to whom all are bound to submit their judgment, and so they have been divided into a thousand sects, even though all are descended from the same Luther. And until now they have not been able to summon a Council in which all agree. But a veiy clear reason explains this. For since the many are equal, it can hardly come about that in obscure and difficult matters anyone will prefer someone else's judgment to his own.

The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 7, col. 522ff. respond that

the unity of Faith can be preserved by the association of many Churches, which assist each other, and deal with questions about the Faith by exchanging documents among themselves. But surely that is not sufficient. For, to preserve the unity of Faith, counsel is not enough; supreme authority is required. For, what will happen, if an erring bishop refused to write to the others, or if after he has written, he refuses to follow the counsel of the others? Was it not the case with Illyricus himself, having been warned by his colleagues that he should retract his Manichean error about original sin, once again summoned forth by him from hell, was it not the case that he could not be made to appear or listen patiently to what they had to say? And if that association is so effective, why has it not finally produced peace and harmony among the flexible and the rigid Lutherans?

You will say: the problems will be solved by a general Council; for, all will follow the majority of the bishops. But in a Council the majority can err, if the authority of the supreme pastor is lacking, as has been proved by the Councils of Ariminum and Ephesus II. Add to this that general Councils cannot always be summoned; for, during the first 300 years no general Council could be held, and still there were several heresies during that time.

Now we will refute their objections. First of all, Calvin in book 4, chapter 20 § 7 raises an objection based on Luke 22:24-26 where we read this: *A dispute also arose among them, which of them was to be regarded as the greatest. And he said to them, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them... But not so with you.* To this Calvin said: *In order to restrain their fickle ambition, the Lord taught them that their ministry is not like that of kingdoms, in which one takes precedence over others.*

I respond that both in this place and in Matt. 20:25-28 the Lord did not take monarchy away from the Church, but rather instituted it, and admonished them that it is different from the civil monarchy of the Gentiles. For first of all the Lord does not say, *you will not exercise lordship in any way,* but, *you will not be like the kings of the Gentiles.* But he who says, *you will not rule the way they do,* is signifying this: *You will indeed rule, but in a way different from their way.* Then, does he not clearly add in this place: *Rather let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader,* in Greek ἡγούμενος, that is, the leader and chief, *as one who serves?* Therefore, one leader was designated by the Lord.

Finally, he explains the matter by his own example: *Just as I have not come to be served, but to serve.* And: *I am among you as one who serves.* Nevertheless, he says about himself in John 13:13: *You call me Teacher and Lord; and you are right, for so I am.* Therefore, just as Christ did not domineer, but served and worked, and nevertheless truly presided, indeed was Lord, so also he wants one of his own truly to preside, but without the longing to domineer, such as it is found among the kings of the Gentiles, who often are tyrants, and force their subjects to serve them, and refer everything to their own comfort and glory. For, he wants his vicar to preside over the Church as a shepherd and father, who does not seek riches and honor, but the well-being of his subjects, and so more than others works for and serves the benefit of all.

Furthermore, the kings of the Gentiles, also those who are not tyrants, administer their kingdoms so that they can leave them to their sons as an inheritance; but prelates

of the Church are not like that. For, they are not kings, but vicars, not householders, but overseers. Hence, St. Bernard in book 3 on Consideration said: *What, you do not deny that you preside, and you are not allowed to domineer? Clearly so, as if he does not preside well who presides in solicitude; you preside in order to provide, to counsel, to procure and to serve; you preside to be helpful, you preside to be a faithful and prudent servant, whom the Lord has established over his family.*

The second objection of Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 1 in the Institutes is the following. In Eph. 4:11 the Apostle outlined for us the whole ecclesiastical hierarchy, which Christ left on earth after his Ascension; in that place there is no mention of one head, but the government of the Church is entrusted to many in common. For he says this: *And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors, some teachers.* And he did not say: *But first of all, there is one supreme pontiff, then bishops, pastors, etc.*

Likewise: *Be eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith,* and he did not say: *one sovereign pontiff, who keeps the Church in unity.* And in the same place: *Grace was given to each one of us according to the measure of Christ i gift.* And he did not say: *The fullness of power is given to one, and he takes the place of Christ,* but he said, *his own portion is given to each one.*

I respond that the Supreme Pontificate is clearly stated by the Apostle in these words: *And his gifts were given to the Apostles;* and even more clearly in 1 Cor. 12:28 where he says: *And God has appointed in the Church first Apostles, second prophets.* If indeed supreme ecclesiastical power was given not only to Peter, but also to the other Apostles, since all could say this with Paul: *There is the daily pressure upon me of my anxiety for all the Churches* (2 Cor. 11:28), still it was given to Peter as the ordinary pastor who was perpetually to have successors, but to the others as delegates who did not have successors. For, it was necessary in the beginning of the Church, in order to spread the Faith rapidly throughout the whole world, that supreme power and freedom should be given to the first preachers and founders of the Churches; however, after the Apostles died, the apostolic authority remained only in the successor of Peter. For, no bishop besides the Roman bishop ever had the care of all the Churches, and only he was called the apostolic pontiff, and his See simply "apostolic," and by antonomasia his office was also called apostolic. We will now present a few witnesses of this matter.

Jerome in letter 2 to Damasus on the word Hypostasis said: *May you follow the apostles, who follow them in honor.* And in book 2 against Ruffinus he said: *I admire how the bishops accept what the apostolic See has condemned.* And in the letter of many French bishops to Leo, which is number 52 among the letters of Leo, they said: *May your apostleship forgive our tardiness.* And at the end of that letter: *Pray for me, blessed Lord, deservedly and with apostolic honor to be venerated as pope.* Likewise: *I venerate and greet in the Lord your apostleship.* Augustine in letter 162 said: *The preeminence of the apostolic See has always flourished in the Roman Church.*

Finally (while I omit many similar examples) the Council of Chalcedon in the letter to Leo, which is given after the third session: *And after all these things,* they said, *in*

addition and contrary to the one to whom the care of the vine was given by the Savior, he increased his madness, that is, by also going against your apostolic holiness. Hence St. Bernard in book 3, near the beginning of his treatise on Consideration, speaking about all the Apostles, concerning whom it is said in Ps. 45:17, *you will make them princes in all the earth,* says to Pope Eugene: *You have succeed them in the inheritance: so you are the heir, and you inherit the world.* And after that in this verse, *and he appointed certain ones to be apostles,* he understands it to be about the pontifical authority.

It can also be responded that the Apostle in this place is not defining the hierarchy of the Church, but only stating various gifts that are in the Church. For, first he says *Apostles,* that is, the first ones sent forth by God. Secondly, *prophets,* that is, those who foretell the future, as Chrysostom, Oecumenius and Theophlact explain it. Thirdly, *evangelists,* that is, those who wrote the gospels, as Oecumenius and Theophylact explain it. Finally, *pastors and teachers,* and with this word he signified confusedly the whole hierarchy of the ministers of the Church. And in 1 Cor. 12:28 he adds the different languages, healings and other things, which are not Church ministries, but charisms of the Holy Spirit.

To the other objection about one body, one spirit, one Faith, one God, in which one Pope is not mentioned, I respond that one Pope is included in those words "one body and one spirit"; for, just as in a natural body the unity of the members is preserved, because all are subject to the head, so also then in the Church unity is preserved, since all are obedient to one head.

And although the head of the whole Church is Christ, nevertheless, since he is absent from the militant Church according to his visible presence, someone else in the place of Christ is necessarily required, who maintains this visible Church in unity. Accordingly, Optatus in book 2 calls Peter the head, and he locates the unity of the Church in him, so that all are in agreement with this head. Also John Chrysostom, in homily 55 on Matthew, says this about the Church: *Its pastor and head is a simple fisherman, etc.*

Concerning the question about the fullness of power, I respond that the Supreme Pontiff, if he is compared with Christ, does not have the fullness of power, but only a certain portion of it, according to the measure of the gift of Christ. For, Christ rules the whole Church, which is in heaven, in purgatory, on earth, and which was from the beginning of the world, and will be until the end. Furthermore, as he wishes he can establish laws, institute sacraments, and confer grace, even without the sacraments.

But the Pope rules only that part of the Church which is on earth, while he is living, and he cannot change the laws of Christ, or institute sacraments, or forgive sins without the sacrament. However, if the Supreme Pontiff is compared with the other bishops, he is rightly said to have the fullness of power, because the others have definite regions over which they preside, and also a limited power. But the Pope is the head of the whole Christian world, and he has the total and full power, which Christ left on earth for the use of the Church.

The third objection of Calvin is in book 4, chapter 6 § 9 where he presents this argument: *Christ is the head of the Church* (Eph. 4:15); therefore, whoever designates another head does injury to Christ.

I respond that no injury is done to Christ because the Pope is the head of the Church,

indeed rather his glory is increased. For, we are not saying that the Pope is the head of the Church with Christ, but under Christ as his minister and vicar. No injury is done to a king, if the king's representative is said to be the head of the kingdom under the king, rather his glory is increased; for, all who learn that the king's representative is the head of the kingdom under the king, realize immediately that the king is the head in a more noble manner.

You can add to this that in the Scripture Christ himself, who said of himself, *I am the light of the world* (John 8:12), said the same thing to the Apostles in Matt. 5:14, *you are the light of the world,* but by saying that he did no injury to himself. And the Apostle who said, *no other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ* (1 Cor. 3:11), also said, *you are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets* (Eph. 2:20). And since Christ is *the Shepherd and Guardian of our souls* (1 Pet. 2:25), and Ae *apostle of our confession* (Heb. 3:1), and *a prophet* (Luke 24:19), and *a teacher of justice* (Joel 2:23), nevertheless Paul did no injury to him when he wrote in Eph. 4:11 that in the Church there are apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers. Finally, what name is more majestic than that of God? Nevertheless, more than once in the Scriptures men are called gods without any injury to the true God: Ps. 82:6: *I said, you are gods.* Therefore, why will it be an injury to Christ, the head of the Church, if another man under him is also called the head?

But, they say, nowhere is the Church said to be the body of Peter, or of the Pope, but only of Christ. I respond that the reason for this matter is because Christ alone is the principal and perpetual head of the whole Church. For, just as the kingdom is not said to belong to the king's representative, but to the king, and as the house does not belong to the overseer but to the householder, so the Church is not the body of Peter or of the Pope, who governs it only for a time and in the place of another, but it is the body of Christ, who rules it by his own authority and perpetually.

Furthermore, when the Church is said to be the body of Christ, that word "Christ" can be referred properly, not so much to Christ as head, as to the same Christ as the hypostasis of his body, as when we say "there lies the body of Peter, there the body of Paul," we do not mean that Peter and Paul are bodies, but persons to whom those bodies belong. For, Christ is not only the head of the Church, but he is as it were a huge body composed of many different members. St. Augustine mentioned this in book 1, chapter 31 in his treatise on Merits and Remission of Sin, because the Apostle in 1 Cor. 12:12, when he says: *For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body,* he does not add, *so it is with the body of Christ,* but, *so it is with Christ.* Therefore, the Church is the body of Christ, not of Peter, because Christ as the hypostasis of this body sustains all the members, and works all things in all of them. He sees through eyes, he hears through ears, for it is he who teaches through the teacher, baptizes through the minister, and finally does everything through all of them. This certainly applies neither to Peter nor to any other man.

The fourth objection comes from Theodore Beza, who in chapter 5, article 5 of the Confessions, says that only God can carry the burden of governing the whole Church. Therefore he says that we are affirming something impossible, when we commit the

government of the whole Church to the Supreme Pontiff. Earlier Luther had said the same thing in his book on the power of the Pope; and the little book on the primacy of the Pope, written at the Smalkaldic Synod, agreed with him on this matter.

I respond that it cannot happen without a miracle that one man alone could rule the whole Church by himself, and no Catholic teaches such a thing. But that one person can do it through many ministers and pastors under him not only is possible, but we think it is also very useful and fitting. For, first of all, does not the Apostle say in 2 Cor. 11:28 that he had *solicitude for all the churches?* And he is not speaking only about all the Churches he had founded, but simply about all of them. For, Chrysostom, concerning this text, writes that Paul had the care of the whole world; he says he could prove this from the letters to the Romans, Colossians and Hebrews. For he writes to those to whom he had not preached, and still he thought that they were under his care.

And although the Apostles among themselves allotted to each one his own area to preach the word of God, however in spite of this they did not limit their care for the Church to just one province, but each one of them assumed care for the whole Church, as if that care pertained to him alone.

Nβχζ many secular princes had huge kingdoms from God, and certainly larger than the present whole Christian world; if they had not been able to administer them, they never would have been given to them by God. We have examples in Nebuchadnezzar, about whom we read this in Dan. 2:37-38: *You are the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, and the might, and the glory, and into whose hand he has given, wherever they dwell, the sons of men.* Similarly, we read about Cyrus in Isa. 45:1 : *Thus says the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have grasped, to subdue nations before him and ungird the loins of kings, etc.*

But how huge this empire was is known from Esther 1:1, where the Persian king Ahasuerus is said to have reigned over 127 provinces reaching from India to Ethiopia. In Luke 2:1 we read about Augustus: *A decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled.* And certainly the world has never been administered more favorably than it was during the time of Augustus. But that his kingdom had been prepared by God so that the Gospel could be spread more easily throughout the whole world is mentioned by Eusebius in book 3, chapter 9 of his Demonstration of the Gospel, and by Leo in sermon 1 on Saints Peter and Paul.

Therefore, since God willed that almost the whole world should be under the command of one man, why could he not also commend the whole Church to the prudence and care of one man?—especially since ecclesiastical government is easier than the political kind, and those kings did not have any more help than their own human prudence and the general providence of God. Our Pontiff, however, has the supernatural light of faith, the Holy Scriptures, the heavenly sacraments, and the special assistance of the Holy Spirit.

You can add to this that democracy or aristocracy in the Church is much more difficult than monarchy. For, the democracy of the Church would not be such as it was for the Romans and Athenians, where men were in charge of only one city, which they could without difficulty convene together and take many votes concerning whatever they wanted. For, if there were popular government in the Church, all the Christians in the

whole world would have the right to vote; but who could assemble all Christians in order to decide something in common for the whole Church?

Similarly, the aristocracy of the Church would not be such as it was for the Venetians, in which only the nobles of one city ruled, who could easily assemble and decide whatever they wanted. But the Church would be such as Venice never was, namely, where all the magistrates of the whole world, that is, all the bishops and priests of the whole Christian world would have an equal right of governing, and it would be extremely difficult or impossible without a miracle to gather them all together.

The fifth objection is in that little book, which the Lutherans published about the primacy of the Pope at the Smalkaldic Synod. Paul, they said, in 1 Cor. 3:21 makes all the ministers equal, and he teaches that the Church is over the ministers, when he says: *all things are yours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas.*

I respond that I am not sharp enough to grasp the force of this argument. For, if on that account the ministers are made equal because they are numbered together, since it says—whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, then also generals, consuls and emperors will be equal, because Chrysostom in homily 83 on Matthew says: *If a general, if a consul, if he who wears the crown, enters unworthily, prevent him and force him to stop, etc.* Also it does not follow that the Church is superior to the ministers in authority and power, because they were instituted for the sake of their usefulness to the Church, just because Paul signified it with these words, *all things are yours.* Otherwise students would be ruling their teachers, and the people would preside in authority over kings, because teachers are for the sake of students, and kings for the sake of the people, and not vice versa.

The sixth objection is in the same little book: Christ sent all the Apostles in the same way, since he says in John 20:21, *I am sending you;* therefore, he did not put one over the others.

I respond that with those words he is not placing one over the others, but other places are not lacking in which one is made to preside. Certainly in John 21:17 it is said to one, *feed my sheep.*

Finally, others object: if the world should be governed by one person in the things pertaining to religion, then it would also be a good thing that it be governed by one person in things pertaining to the political order. But this has never taken place, nor is it necessary; for, as Augustine teaches in book 4, chapter 15 in *The City of God: It would be better for human affairs, if all kingdoms were small and enjoyed harmonious neighborly relations.*

I respond that the government of the Church and of the State are not the same. Since it is not necessary that the whole world be one kingdom, therefore it does not require one person to preside over all; but the whole Church is one kingdom, one city, one house, and therefore it should be ruled by one person. The reason for this difference is that for the preservation of political kingdoms it is not required that all the provinces observe the same laws, and the same customs; for they can, depending on the diversity of persons and places, have different laws and customs; and therefore one prince is not required who maintains order for all. But for the preservation of the Church it is necessary that all

agree in the same Faith, the same sacraments, the same divinely given laws, which surely cannot take place, unless they are one people, and are maintained in unity by one leader.

But whether it would be a good thing for all the provinces of the world to be governed by one great king in political affairs, although it is not necessary, is an interesting question. But it seems to me to be a very good thing, if it could be accomplished without injustice and destructive wars; especially if the supreme monarch had under himself not vicars or substitute kings, but real princes, as the Sovereign Pontiff has under himself the bishops.

But because it does not seem possible to establish such a monarchy, unless it is done with great force and many wars, therefore St. Augustine rightly says that human relations will be much more happy, if there are small kingdoms everywhere enjoying peaceful relations with each other, rather than if each one by good means and bad attempts to extend its own domination. You can add to this that St. Augustine indeed approves small kingdoms, but he does not deny that it would be helpful, if one supreme emperor were to be over those small kings; rather, he seems to affirm it, since he says that those small kingdoms ought to be living in harmony with each other, as many homes in a city relate to each other. For, it is certain that there is one official over all the homes, although each home has its own master of the house.

CHAPTER X

A THIRD QUESTION IS PROPOSED, AND THE MONARCHY OF PETER IS PROVED FROM MATT. 16

Up to this point it has been explained and, if I am not mistaken, quite carefully proved that monarchy is the best form of government, and that there should be that kind of government in the Church of Christ. Now there is a third question to answer: was the Apostle Peter the head and leader of the whole Church in the place of Christ and constituted such by Christ himself?

All the heretics, whom we cited at the beginning, clearly deny this; on the other hand, the Catholics whom we cited all affirm it For, this really is not a simple error, but a pernicious heresy—to deny the primacy of St. Peter instituted by Christ. We will now begin to prove this for three reasons. First, from two texts of the Gospel in one of which it is promised, and in the other it is conferred. Then from the many privileges and prerogatives of St. Peter. Finally, from the very clear testimonies of the old Greeks and Latins.

Now to begin at the beginning, the first place is Matt. 16:18-19, where we read this: *You are Peter, and on this rock I will build my church... I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.* The plain and obvious meaning of these words is, as we understand it, that under two metaphors preeminence over the whole Church was promised to Peter. The first metaphor is of a foundation and a building; for, what a foundation is to a building, that is what a head is to a body, a mayor to a city, a king to a kingdom, the master of the house to a home. The second metaphor is that of keys; for, the one to whom the keys of the city are given is established as the king, or certainly the governor of the city, who admits whom he will, and excludes whom he will.

The heretics really distort this whole text in amazing ways. For, they do not want to understand that Peter is the rock; and they do not concede that the keys were promised to Peter. And they cannot persuade themselves that, by the metaphors of a foundation and keys, supreme ecclesiastical authority is signified.

Therefore, now we have to answer four questions. First: whether Peter is that rock upon which the Church is founded. Second: whether to be the foundation means to be the ruler of the whole Church. Third: whether Peter is the one to whom the keys are given. Fourth: whether by the keys is understood the full power of governing the Church.

Concerning the first question there are four opinions. The first is the common one of Catholics—that the rock is Peter, that is, that person who was called Peter; not however that he was a particular person, but as the pastor and head of the Church. The second opinion is that of Erasmus on this place, namely, that every believing man is that rock. The third is that of Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 6 in his Institutes—he says that the rock is Christ. The fourth is that of Luther in his book on the power of the Pope, and the Centuriatorians in book 1 of Centuries 1, chapter 4, col. 175 and book 1 of the Smalkaldic Synod on the primacy of the Pope: they claim that the Lord is saying that the rock is faith

or the confession of faith.

The first opinion, which is the true one, first of all is clearly deduced from the text itself. For, the pronoun "this," when he says "and on this rock" refers to that rock about which the Lord had just spoken. For, the Lord had just called Peter the rock. He was speaking Aramaic, and in the Aramaic language "Peter" is called "Cephas," as we read in John 1:42. But the word "Cephas" means "rock," as Jerome says in his comments on Gal. 2 and the matter is most certain. For, wherever in the Hebrew text you find , that is, *rock,* in Aramaic it is *Cepha;* also the word KDD in Hebrew means rock or cliff; for where we read in Jer. 4:29, *they climb among rocks,* in Hebrew it is, ll?^ O'DDl

Therefore, the Lord said: You are Cepha, and upon this Cepha; or, in English, *You are the rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church;* from this it follows that the word "this" can refer only to Peter, who in that place is called the "rock."

But why did the Latin translator not put it like this: *You are the rock (petra),* and upon this rock *(petra)?* The reason is that he followed the Greek codex; for, he did not translate from the Aramaic, but from the Greek where we read, συ εί Πέτρος, και έπι ταύτη τη πέτρα εικοδομήσω μου την έκκλησίαν. But why did the Greek not have, συ εί πέτρα, και έπι ταύτη τη πέτρα? The reason is that, since among the Greeks both πέτρος and πέτρα signify "rock," it seemed better to the translator to give the man a masculine name rather than a feminine one. But then in order to explain the metaphor, in the following phrase he did not want to say, έπι τω πετρω, which would have been ambiguous, but έπι τη πέτρα, which cannot signify anything other than "rock."

On this point there is the agreement of the whole Church, and of the Greek and Latin Fathers. The whole Council of Chalcedon composed of 630 Fathers, in session 3, call Peter the rock (petra) and foundation of the Catholic Church. Likewise in the Church today in the mouth of all are sung, and have been sung for 1200 years those verses of St. Ambrose in the hymn of Lauds for Sundays: *Hoc ipsa petra Ecclesiae canente culpam diluit.* For, St. Augustine in book 1, chapter 21 of his Retractions says that already at his time they had begun to sing from the verses of Ambrose that Peter is the rock upon whom the Lord built his Church.

Furthermore, from the Greek Fathers Origen in homily 5 on Exodus said: *See, to that great foundation of the Church and to the solid rock, upon which Christ built his Church, what did the Lord say: O you of little faith, why did you doubt?*

Athanasius in a letter to Felix, which he wrote in his own name and of the Alexandrine Synod said: *You are Peter, and on your foundation the columns of the Church, that is, the bishops, have been established, etc.* In an elegant manner Athanasius makes Peter the foundation on which the Bishops rest, upon whom, as columns, the whole building is placed.

Basil in book 2 on Eunomius said: *Peter, because of the excellence of his faith, received in himself the building of the Church.* Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration on the moderation to be kept in a disputation said: *Peter is called the rock, and he has the foundation of the Church entrusted to his faith.* Epiphanius on Ancor.: *The Lord,* he said, *constituted Peter, the first of the Apostles, the solid rock upon which the Church of God was constructed.*

Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew said: *The Lord says, You are Peter, and upon you I will build my Church.* And in homily 4 on Isa. 6: *What does this mean,* he said, *that Peter is the foundation of the Church—that vehement lover of Christ, that man ignorant of language and the champion of orators, that ignorant man who nevertheless stopped the mouth of philosophers, the one who broke up the Grecian wisdom as if it were a spider's web, the one who cast his net into the sea and captured the world?* Cyril in book 2, chapter 12 on John said: *And he predicted that his name would no longer be Simon, but Peter, fittingly signifying with this word that on him as on a rock and a solid stone he would build his Church.*

Psellus in his comments on Song 5:15 regarding the words: *His legs are alabaster columns,* said the following: *By the legs understand that Peter is the prince of the Apostles, upon whom the Lord in the Gospel promised that he would build his Church.* The comments of Psellus are to be found in the Commentaries of Theodoretus on the Song of Solomon. Theophylact in comments on Luke 22: *After me,* he said, *you are the rock of the Church and its foundation.* Euthymius on Matt. 16 said: *I will make you the foundation of believers, and upon you I will build my Church.*

From the Latin authors. Tertullian in chapter 22 of his book on prescription said: *Was anything hidden from Peter, called the rock on which the Church was to be built?* Cyprian in his letter to Quintus: *Peter whom the Lord chose as the first, and upon whom he built his Church;* he also repeats similar statements passim.

Hilary on Matt. 16: *O happy foundation of the Church in the acceptance of a new name, and worthy stone for its building, which cancelled the laws of the underworld. O blessed porter of heaven, etc.* But here on the margin Erasmus wrote: Faith is the foundation of the Church; as if the name of Faith was changed, and not of Simon, and faith is the blessed porter of heaven. Why is that so, since in this place Hilary did not even mention faith? Ambrose in sermon 17 said: *Finally, for the solidity of devotion he is called the rock of the Churches, just as the Lord says: You are Peter, etc. And he is called the rock, because he was the first to lay the foundation in acts of faith, and as the immobile stone of the whole Christian work, he supports the structure and total weight.*

Jerome on Matt. 16 said: *According to the metaphor of the rock, it is rightly said to him, I will build my Church upon you.* And in his letter to Damasus on the word hypostasis, speaking about the See of Peter he said: *I know that the Church was built on that rock.*

Augustine on the Psalm against the Donatists: *Count the priests especially on the seat itself of Peter; it is the rock which the proud gates of hell have not conquered.* Note here that both Jerome and Augustine do not say that the rock is Peter, but it is his See, upon which the Church is founded, and against which the gates of hell will not prevail, because Peter is the rock, not as a particular man, but as the Pontiff. The same Augustine said in sermon 15 on the Saints: *Therefore the Lord named Peter the foundation of the Church; and so the Church worthily honors this foundation, upon which the great height of the ecclesiastical edifice is based.*

Maximus in sermon 1 on Saints Peter and Paul: *By Christ Peter was made the rock when the Lord said to him: You are Peter, and upon this rock, etc.* Paulinus in letter 4

to Severus: *Christ is the rock, but he also did not reject the benefit of this word to his disciple, to whom he said, And upon this rock, etc.*

Leo in sermon 2 on the anniversary of his becoming pope: *The dispensation of Truth therefore abides, and the blessed Peter persevering in the strength of the Rock, which he has received, has not abandoned the helm of the Church, which he undertook. For he was ordained before the rest in such a way that from his being called the Rock, from his being pronounced the Foundation, from his being constituted the Doorkeeper of the kingdom of heaven, from his being set as the Umpire to bind and to loose, whose judgments shall retain their validity in heaven, from all these mystical titles we might know the nature of his association with Christ.* Gregoiy 6 in letter 37 to Eulogius: *Who does not know that the holy Church has been made strong in the solidity of the prince of the Apostles?*

From these quotes it is apparent how great the impudence is of some heretics. For, Calvin in the place already cited says that he does not want to cite the Fathers, not because he could not, but because in debating such a clear matter he did not want to burden his readers. Erasmus, however, on this text of Matthew is amazed that some have distorted this text and applied it to the Roman Church, and he endeavors to excuse Cyprian and Jerome, because they said that the Church had been founded on Peter, as if this were an unheard of paradox. But all the Fathers teach this, and many recent authors, both theologians and canonists, and also the ancient Pontiffs—Clement, Anacletus, Marcellus, Pius, Julius and others, whom I have omitted both for the sake of brevity and because they are not recognized by the adversaries.

Now we will examine the second opinion which is that of Erasmus. Erasmus proves by the name of *Rock that all the faithful are to be understood,* borrowing it from Origen, who in tractate 1 on Matthew in explaining this passage says this: *The rock is everyone who is an imitator of Christ, and the Church of God is built on every rock of this kind. For the Church, against which the gates of hell will not prevail, consists in the individual perfect persons, who have in themselves a union of words and works and of all their senses.*

But Origen is explaining this text allegorically, not literally, as Erasmus imagines; but he did explain it in a literal way in the place cited above. But surely that this text cannot be understood in a literal way as applying to all the faithful is evident from the fact that the Lord, in order to show that he is speaking about Peter alone, described him in many ways. For, he called him Simon, which was the name given to him by his parents, and he added the name of his father, calling him the son on Jona, to distinguish him from Simon, the brother of Thaddeus. *Blessed are you,* he said, *Simon Bar-Jona,* and he also added the name "Peter," which he gave to him. Moreover, he uses the pronouns designating a certain person, saying: *I tell you, you are Peter, etc.* Therefore, if it is still allowed to say that even from this nothing special was conferred on Peter, or promised, which was not promised to all the others, certainly all the texts of Scripture can be distorted.

Next, if all the faithful are that rock, upon which the Church is founded, then all will be the foundation. If all are the foundation, where will be the walls and roof of this building? Thus, if the eye is the whole body, where is the hearing? Where are the other members? (1 Cor. 12:14ff.). Add to this, that in the same place Erasmus thinks it is absurd

that the Church should be built on the man Peter: therefore how will it be built on the individual faithful? Are not the others also men?

Now the third explanation is that of Calvin who, although he speaks somewhat more obscurely, still seems to think that the rock is Christ. For the matter is clear, upon which rock the Church is built, since the Apostle says in 1 Cor. 3:11: *No other foundation can anyone lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.*

In addition there is also Augustine, who in his treatise on John 21 said: *Upon this rock, which you have confessed, I will build my Church.* And in sermon 13 on the word of God he has the same thing, and also in book 1, chapter 21 of his Retractions, where he retracts what he had said somewhere, that the Church was built upon Peter, and he teaches that it should rather be said that it was built upon Christ, and that the text we are now considering should be understood in this way.

No one doubts that Christ is the rock, and the first foundation of the Church, and that also from this place it is in some sense deduced; for, if Peter is the foundation of the Church in the place of Christ, Christ is that foundation much more. But nevertheless the real sense, and as I may say, the immediate and literal sense is that the Church is to be built upon Peter. In addition to the reasons given above, this is proved with its own proper arguments

First, the pronoun "this" cannot be referred to Christ the rock, but to Peter the rock; for it must be referred to something near, not to something remote. But it was said in the "near" sense not to Christ, but to Peter: *You are Cephas,* that is, *the rock.* Then, although Christ can be said to be the rock, nevertheless in this place he is not called the rock by Peter in his confession, but the Christ, the Son of the living God. But the word "this" must be referred to one who is named the rock, not to the one who is not called by this name. Likewise, if it referred to Christ, why was it said: *I tell you, you are Peter?* Clearly it would be in vain, unless what follows refers to Peter. Finally, if it referred to Christ, the Lord would not say "I will build," but "I am building" my Church. For, in itself he had already built up the Apostles and many disciples. But he says "I will build," because he had not yet established Peter as the foundation, but was going to do it after his resurrection.

In response to Calvin's argument, I say that Paul is talking not about just any, but about the primary foundation; otherwise, he would be contradicting himself, since he says in Eph. 2:20: you are *built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* And he would also be opposed to John, who in Rev. 21:14 describes the twelve foundations of the edifice of the Church, and explains that by those foundations the Apostles are meant

In reply to Augustine, I say, first of all, that he is not rejecting our opinion, but only preferring another to it. For this is what he says in book 1, chapter 21 of his Retractions: *I said somewhere about the apostle Peter, that upon him as upon a rock the Church was founded; this meaning is also sung in the mouth of many in the verses of St. Ambrose, where he says about the crowing cock: at this singing, the rock of the Church takes away our guilt. But I know that later I often explained it in such a way that "upon this" would be understood as the one whom Peter confessed. For, it was not said to him: You are the rock, but you are Peter; but the rock was Christ. But let the reader choose which of these*

mo *opinions seems to be more probable.* These are his words. Therefore, Augustine does not think it is blasphemy, as Calvin thinks, that the Church is built on Peter.

I add something else, namely, that Augustine was misled only because of his ignorance of Hebrew. For, his argument is (as he says in this place), because it was not said, *You are the rock (petra),* but *You are Peter (Petrus).* Therefore, he thought that the rock, upon which the Church is built, is not Peter, because he believed that *Cephas* does not mean "rock," but something derived from a rock, as if we were to say "rocky" or "stony"; just as he word "Christian" does not signify Christ, but something derived from Christ. Therefore, since the Church is built upon a rock, and not on something rocky or rock-like, so Augustine thought that by that rock it is not Peter, but Christ who is to be understood. But if he had understood that "Cephas" means nothing other than a rock, and that the Lord had said, *You are the rock, and upon this rock, etc.,* he would have had no doubts about the truth of our opinion.

Finally, there is the fourth opinion, which is held by almost all Lutherans, and seems to be able to be confirmed by the testimonies of the Fathers. Since Hilary in book 6 on the Trinity said: *Upon this rock of confession is the building of the Church.* Likewise: *This faith of the Church is the foundation; through this faith the gates of hell against it are weak; this faith has the keys of the kingdom of heaven, etc.* Ambrose in book 6, chapter 9 on Luke: *The foundation of the Church,* he said, *is faith.* Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew: *Upon this rock I will build my Church, that is, faith and confession.* He explains it in the same way in homily 83 on Matthew. Similarly, Cyril in book 4 on the Trinity said while explaining this text: *I think that he called the rock nothing other than the unshaken and firm faith of the disciple.*

Illyricus adds: if the Church was founded on Peter, and not rather on the confession of Faith, it would have been ruined immediately. For, in the same chapter 16 of Matthew it is said to him: *Get behind me Satan! You are a hindrance to me; for you are not on the side of God.* Then also he denied Christ three times, and not without a strong oath (Matt. 26:69ff.).

I respond that Faith or its confession can be considered in two ways: in one way absolutely according to itself, and without relation to the person of Peter; in another way with a relation to Peter. In the first way the adversaries seem to want faith to be the foundation of the Church, but certainly they are in error; for if that were the case, the Lord would not say, *Upon this rock I will build my Church,* but *I am building, or I have built my Church.* For, already many believed him to be the Son of the living God, like the ancient prophets, the Blessed Virgin, Simeon, Zechariah, John the Baptist, the Apostles and other disciples.

Next, faith taken absolutely is rightly said to be the foundation of justification, and of all the virtues, as Augustine says in sermon 22 on the word of the Apostles: *By believing the house of God has its foundation, by hoping it is erected, and by loving it is perfected.* But faith in the proper sense is not the foundation of the Church; for the foundation and the rest of the building must all be of the same nature, but the Church is a congregation of men, as it were of living stones, as is said in 1 Pet. 2:5; therefore the stone that is the foundation must also be a man, not some virtue.

Finally, the pronoun "this" clearly shows that by the rock faith could not be understood absolutely; for, it refers to the rock just named; but in a proximate way it was said to Simon: *You are the rock,* not of the faith; therefore it is necessary to take faith in the second way, and to say that not any kind of faith, but the faith of Peter, and of Peter not as a private man, but as the pastor of the Church who is the foundation. This agrees with what we have said up to this point, namely, that Peter is the foundation.

For, the faith of Peter is said to be the foundation of the Church for two reasons. Pîκζ because on account of the merit of his faith Peter obtained that he is the foundation of the Church, as Jerome, Hilary, Chrysostom and others explain it in reference to this passage. Second, because Peter especially is the foundation of the Church, since his faith cannot fail, and so he must confirm and sustain all others in the faith. For, the Lord said to him in Luke 22:32: *I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.*

Therefore, since by reason of his indefectible faith Peter is a solid rock, supporting the whole Church, this is the same as to say that upon Peter and upon his faith the Church has been founded, and this is what the cited Fathers have said. For, St. Hilary, in the cited quote, after he had said that Peter's faith is the foundation of the Church, and had received the keys of the kingdom, adds this about Peter himself: *By his confession he merited the supereminent position of his blessed faith.* And briefly after that: *Hence he has the keys of the kingdom of heaven; hence his earthly judgments are heavenly, etc.*

Therefore, just as he had said that faith is the foundation and that he has the keys, so now he says that Peter by reason of his faith has merited a supereminent position, that is, that he is the head, or foundation and has the keys. And he himself in comments on Matt. 16 very clearly says about Peter: *O happy foundation of the Church in the acceptance of a new name.*

Similarly, Ambrose in book 6, chapter 9 of his commentary on Luke, where he says that Peter's faith is the foundation of the Church, also says in the same place: *He did not deny the grace of this name to his disciple, so that he is Peter, who has like a rock the solidity of constancy, and the firmness of faith.*

Chrysostom in both of the quoted texts, explaining what it means for the Church to be built on the confession of Peter, introduces the Lord saying this: *I will build my Church upon you.*

Finally, Cyril also in the cited place says that not just any kind of faith is the foundation, but that unshaken and solid faith of St. Peter; and in book 2, chapter 12 on John, he writes that Peter himself is the rock upon which the Church is founded.

To the objection of Illyricus I respond first of all with Jerome in his commentary on this chapter. He says that Peter, when he heard "get behind me Satan," and when he denied Christ, was not yet the foundation. For, in this place Christ promised him what he was going to give him after his resurrection. I also add that Peter did not err in faith, but only that he did not know something when he heard "get behind me Satan," and he fell away in love, not in faith, when he denied Christ. We will say more about this in the treatise on the Church.

CHAPTER XI

WHAT IT MEANS FOR THE CHURCH TO BE BUILT UPON A ROCK IN MATT. 16

Another difficulty remains to be explained, namely, what it means for the Church to be built upon a rock. And the adversaries pay little attention to this; for, since they have already denied that Peter is the foundation of the Church, they think it makes little difference what that building signifies.

Catholics, however, teach that by this metaphor is signified that the government of the whole Church has been committed to Peter, and especially regarding his faith. For, this is proper to a fundamental rock, namely, that it governs and supports the whole building. And this is the way in which the Fathers explain it. Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew, when explaining this text, said: *It constitutes him the pastor of the Church.* And after that: *The Father set Jeremiah over one people, but Christ set Peter over the whole world.* Ambrose in sermon 47 said: *Peter is called the rock, because like an immovable stone he supports the structure and building of the whole Christian work.* Gregory in book 4, letter 32 said: *It is obvious to all who know the gospel that by the word of the Lord the care of the whole Church was committed to St. Peter, the prince of all the Apostles. For it was said to him: You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*

But two arguments are often raised in objection to this. The first is that of Luther in his book on the power of the pope, where he says that the conclusion is not valid—that the Church is built on Peter, and therefore Peter is the ruler of the Church. As it is rightly said that the Church is built on faith, and still it does not follow that faith is the ruler of the Church.

I respond that we said that it is not proper to say that the Church is built upon faith. Then, even if it were said properly, the argument would conclude nothing; for, all things must be understood as accommodated to their natures. Therefore, if it is said, the Church is built on faith, the meaning would have to be that the Church is understood to depend on faith as on a principle of justification, and on a certain gift, without which the spouse of Christ would not exist; but if it is said that it is built on Peter, the meaning will be that the Church depends on Peter as its ruler; for such is the dependence of one man upon another.

The second argument is more difficult. Since in this place Peter is called the foundation of the Church, so elsewhere all the Apostles are called the foundations. Thus Ps. 87 says: *Its foundations are on the holy mountains,* that is, as Augustine explains it, on the Apostles and prophets. And in Rev. 21:14: *And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and on them the twelve names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb.* And Eph. 2:20: *Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* St. Jerome, alluding to these words in book 1 against Jovinianus, said: *But you say the Church is built upon Peter, although it is said elsewhere that the Church is built on all the apostles, and so the steadfastness of the Church rightly is made firm on them.* Therefore, nothing proper and singular was given to Peter.

I respond that in three ways all the Apostles were foundations of the Church, but without any prejudice to Peter. In one way, because they first established Churches

everywhere, since Peter did not convert the whole world to the Faith, but Peter brought some regions to Christ, James brought others, as did also the other Apostles. Therefore St. Paul said in Rom. 15:20: *I have preached, not where Christ has already been named, lest I build on another man's foundation.* And 1 Cor. 3:10: *Like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and another man is building upon it.* And in this way justly the Apostles are the foundation; we believe that this is the meaning of Rev. 21:14.

In another way the Apostles and prophets are said to be the foundation of the Church by reason of the doctrine revealed by God. Since the faith of the Church relies on revelation, which the Apostles and prophets received from God; for new articles are not always being revealed to the Church, but the Church lives according to the teaching, which the Apostles and prophets learned from the Lord, and handed on to posterity by preaching or in a written form. And for this reason we are built up, as the Apostle says in Eph. 2:20, *on the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* So in these two ways Peter is not greater than the others, but as Jerome says, *in all the steadfastness of the Church rightly is made firm.*

In the third way all the Apostles are said to be the foundation by reason of government. For, all were heads, rulers and pastors of the whole Church, but not in the same way as Peter. For, they had supreme and ample power as Apostles or legates, but Peter had it as the ordinary pastor; then they had their fullness of power in such a way that Peter was nevertheless their head, and they depended on him, not vice versa.

And this is what is promised to Peter in Matt. 16:18, when to him alone in the presence of others it was said: *On this rock I will build my Church.* This is what, besides other things cited above, Jerome in book 1 against Jovinianus says, while explaining the meaning of the fact that the Church is built upon Peter: *Although the steadfastness of the Church is made firm equally on all the Apostles, nevertheless one is chosen so that, having been established as the head, the danger of schism may be removed.*

CHAPTER XII

WHO IS THE ONE WHO WHOM IT IS SAID: I WILL GIVE YOU THE KEYS? (MATT. 16:19)

The third doubt concerns the person to whom it is said: *I will give you the keys.* For, although the meaning of these words for Catholic teachers seems to be crystal clear, still the adversaries have so distorted these words that they seem now to be very obscure. Who, I ask, while simply reading: *Blessed are you Simon Bar-Jona,* and then immediately: *I will give you the keys,* will not say that the keys have been promised by Christ to the son of Jona?

But nevertheless Luther in his book on the power of the Pope, Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 4ff. in his Institutes, the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, books 1 and 2 passim, the Smalkaldic book on the primacy of the Pope, and all the other contemporary heretics, say that nothing special was promised to Peter, the son of Jona. They say that whatever is said here pertains to the whole Church, and at the time Peter was the leader of the Church.

But it is to be noted that Peter could have managed the Church in two ways, historically and metaphorically. Indeed he takes the part of another historically who in a thing done by himself, signifies something done by another, and in a certain way represents it. Thus, Abraham having two sons was a sign of God, who was going to have two peoples, as the Apostle explains it in Gal. 4:22ff.; thus, Martha being busy about many things, and Mary sitting at the feet of the Lord represent two ways of life—of which one consists in action and the other in contemplation.

Metaphorically, by one thing something else is signified, when no thing done is proposed, but something similar is imagined in order to signify it: as in the Gospel—the one sowing good seed signifies Christ preaching. In this way also the legates of the king are wont to receive the keys of the city, while in the meantime they really acquire nothing for themselves, and they only represent the person of their king.

Since that is the way things are, the adversaries think that Peter signifies the Church in this second way, when he heard the Lord say: *I will give you the keys.* From this it follows that the keys were given first of all to the Church herself, and through the Church they are communicated to the pastors, and that this is the literal meaning of this text. *Therefore he gives,* said the Smalkaldic Synod in the book on the primacy of the Pope, *the keys to the Church principally and immediately, just as for the same reason the Church has the right of vocation.*

But we believe that Peter ruled the Church in the first way. Thus, for example, he truly and principally, and (as they say) immediately received the keys, and at the same time by receiving them signified that the whole Church later would accept him. Somewhat later we will explain what we mean by this way, but for now we will treat this matter briefly.

First of all, therefore, Christ designated the person of Peter in so many ways that the clerks who compose public documents are not wont to describe any certain man with more details (as Cajetan rightly pointed out). For, he expressed the substance of an individual person through the pronoun "you"; then he added the name given him at

his birth, when he says, *Blessed are you Simon.* He adds the name of his father, when he says, *Son of Jona;* and he does not want to omit the name given him recently by himself, *I tell you,* he says, *because you are Peter.* Why is there such an accurate description, if nothing is really promised to Peter himself? Then, at that time Peter was not a legate or vicar of the Church; for, who imposed on him a province of this kind? Therefore, we are not able to surmise that he received the keys in the name of the Church, and not rather in his own name.

Furthermore, the keys are really promised by Christ to him who had said: *You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* For, that is what those words signified, *I tell you,* and as St. Jerome says, his true confession receives its reward. But Peter proclaimed that admirable confession, and he did it in his own person; therefore in his own person he received the promise of the keys.

To these reasons, if it is still denied that the keys were promised to Peter, because he took the part of the Church, certainly for the same reason we will deny it. Abraham had two sons, because those two sons, according to the Apostle, represented two peoples. And we will not admit that Martha was busy about many things, while her sister Maiy sat at the feet of the Lord, because those two women in some way represent action and contemplation. And if it is a serious matter to call into doubt such clear historical events, it must also seem serious to doubt whether something singular was promised to Peter, since it is narrated so plainly in the evangelical history.

Finally, it was said to him by the Lord, *I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven,* and shortly thereafter he heard from the same Lord, *Get behind me, Satan. You are a hindrance to me,* and these latter words were said to Peter alone, and in his own proper person, as is clearly gathered from the gospel, and even Luther himself teaches in his book on the power of the Pope. Therefore who can deny that the keys were promised to Peter in his own proper person?

But perhaps it was not said to the same man, *I will give you the keys,* and *Get behind me, Satan;* but actually it is surely the same man. For, in the same chapter of Matthew's gospel both are recorded, and in both places the name of Peter is expressed, and all the ancient Fathers agree in this evaluation. Certainly Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom and Theophylact on Matt. 16 clearly teach that it is said to the same Peter, *I will give you the keys,* to whom it is said, *Follow me.*

For, although Hilary does not dare to apply the word "Satan" to Peter, still he refers to Peter the words that follow, that is, *Follow me.* And the same author in books 6 and 10 on the Trinity and on Ps. 132 does apply the word "Satan" to Peter: *When Peter made this error through ignorance, did He not call him "Satan" and a "stumbling-block"? Tine was Peter, who deprecated the mystery of the Passion, established in the faith by so sharp a rebuke from the lips of the gentle Christ, whom not flesh and blood, but the Father in heaven had revealed to him.* And Augustine in book 1, chapter 31 against the two letters against Gaudentius: *Was Razias,* he said, *better than the Apostle Peter who, when he said, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God," was called so blessed by the Lord that he merited to receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven? Nevertheless because of that he is believed not to be imitated, when immediately at the same time he heard the rebuke "Get*

behind me, Satan, you are not on the side of God."

What Ambrose says in chapter 3 of his book on Isaac is similar, where he explains the words of the Lord to Peter in John 13:36: *Where I am going you cannot follow me now; but you shall follow afterward. He had given to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and he declared him unprepared to follow him.* Here clearly St. Ambrose says that the keys have been given to the very same person to whom it was said, "You cannot follow now; but you shall follow me afterward." But it is certain that these words were said to Peter in his own person, just as in his own person, having been truly crucified, he followed Christ in dying.

But Luther objects to these arguments in his book on the power of the Pope. First, it is certain that the Lord said to Peter, *Get behind me, Satan. You are not on the side of God.* But these words are not fitting for someone to whom the Father revealed heavenly secrets, and who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Therefore, not in his own person, but in the person of the Church he heard that heavenly revelation, and received the keys of the kingdom of God.

We respond that all those things are fitting for the same person, as we have already demonstrated, but not for the same reason. For Peter, by a gift of God, has the revelation and receives the keys; but because of his own weakness he is offended by the passion and death of Christ. And the name of "Satan" should not startle us; for it does not mean the devil, but an adversary; since the word among the Hebrews means nothing more than an adversary. Therefore, although passim the devil is called Satan, still the name "Satan" does not signify the devil everywhere.

There is a second objection. Peter in the name of all the Apostles said: *You are the Christ, the Son of the living God;* therefore, in the name of all the Apostles he heard, *I will give you the keys.* Moreover, it is quite certain that Peter responded to Christ in the name of all, both from Chrysostom, who in commenting on this text says that Peter was the mouth of the Apostles; and from Jerome, who says that Peter was speaking for all; and from Augustine, who says in the Sermon 13 on the word of God that one responded for all. It is also evident from the fact that Christ asked all the disciples: *But who do you say that I am?* For, either all the disciples are to be blamed, because they did not answer his question, or, which is more credible, Peter answered in the name of all.

I respond that Peter answered in the name of all, not as a herald, but as the leader and head, and the mouth, as Chrysostom says, of the Apostles. For, he alone answered, when the others did not know what to say, but by their silence they approved of Peter's confession, and in that way they all answered through the mouth of Peter. Therefore, just as Peter alone responded, and the others assented to it, so Christ promised the keys to Peter alone, but after him they were to be communicated also to them.

That this is the case we prove with this reason. If Peter had responded in the name of all, or if he brought it about that the others required this office from him, or he knew what they were going to respond—these are two possibilities neither of which is true. Not the first one, because he learned this from a revelation of the Father, not from human consultation with the others, because the Lord says: *Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, etc.* Not the second, because the revelation was made to him alone. Likewise,

because if he knew the mind of the others, he would have indicated this in some other way, as he did in John 6:68 when he says: *To whom shall we go? You have the words of eternal life.* And, *We have believed, and have come to know, that you are the Christ, the Son of God.* On this text Chrysostom says that Peter spoke for all, *and we have believed,* and therefore warned Christ that it was not true of all of them. For, Judas did not believe: *Did I not choose you,* he said, *the twelve, and one of you is a devil?* But when Peter said, *You are the Christ, the Son of the living God,* because he did not mention the others, the Lord simply approved the confession of Peter.

There are also the testimonies of the ancient Fathers, who teach clearly that Peter spoke first in such a way that he did not know what the others were thinking about the same matter. Hilary said on this point: *He was judged worthy, because he was the first one to acknowledge that God is in Christ, etc.* If he was the first, then the revelation was not made at the same time to the others. And in book 6 on the Trinity: *In the silence of all the Apostles,* he said, *by a revelation from the Father he knew he is the Son of God, etc.* And also in the same place he wrote: *Peter said what the human voice had not yet uttered.*

Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew: *When he asked for the opinion of men, they all responded; but when he asked what his own disciples thought, Peter immediately came forward and said: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* Cyril in book 12, chapter 64 on John said: *As the leader and head of the others he was the first to proclaim: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* Augustine in sermon 24 on time said: *This is Peter, who by a divine revelation, being the first of all, merited to confess the truth, saying: You are the Christ, etc.*

Leo in sermon 11 on the Passion of the Lord said: *Deservedly the Apostle St. Peter was praised for his confession of this unity, for, when the Lord asked what his disciples thought about himself, immediately anticipating the answers of all of them he said:* Kw *are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And in sermon 2 on Saints Peter and Paul he said: *He was the first to confess the Lord, who was the first in apostolic dignity.* And from these testimonies it is clearly gathered that Peter responded for all for no other reason than that all the others willingly assented to the thinking of Peter.

The third objection. The keys are promised to Peter, not as he is the son of Jona, but as he is a hearer of the heavenly Father; therefore, really they are promised to a hearer of the heavenly Father, not to flesh and blood. But we do not have certainty about any definite man, whether or not he is a true hearer of the Father. But we are certain that the Church depends continuously on the word of God the Father; therefore the keys were not promised to any certain man, but to the Church.

I respond that this argument of Luther conflicts amazingly with the words of the gospel. For, Christ says, *Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona.* And right after that, *I will ltfve you the keys;* but Luther says that the keys were not given or promised to Simon Bar-Jona. Again, Christ says, *My Father who is in heaven has revealed this to you.* But Luther says that we are not certain about anyone whether he hears the Father, and therefore not about Peter. Therefore it is false, or uncertain, that Christ says, *My Father revealed it to you.* For what did the Father reveal to Peter, if Peter heard nothing? But if Peter heard, and the testimony of Christ is certain, it must also be certain that the keys were given to

Peter, the hearer of the heavenly Father.

Also, to be a hearer of the Father is not the formal reason why the keys are given; otherwise, ecclesiastical authority would depend on the probity of the ministers, which is the heresy of the Donatists, which we see to be rejected even in Augustine Confession, in the chapter on the Church, but it was the occasion, or meritorious cause for the magnificent confession of Peter, which was why the keys were promised to him rather than to the others, as is gathered from the commentaries of Hilary, Jerome, Chrysostom and Theophylact.

The fourth objection. St. Paul in Rom. 4:5 says, *Abraham's faith is reckoned as righteousness,* therefore for all who believe faith is reckoned as righteousness. Therefore in the same way, if, because Peter confessed that Christ is the Son of the living God, he received the keys, certainly all the faithful, who confess Christ, have the keys. This argument, Luther says, is similar in form with the argument of Paul, and it cannot be refuted, unless Paul's argument is also refuted. I respond with Cajetan that this argument is similar in form, but dissimilar in the matter, and therefore it concludes to nothing. For, faith by its nature leads to justification, and it makes a man just from being unjust, or from being just to being more just, if the other things are not lacking, which are required together with faith for justification. But the confession of faith does not lead by its very nature to the reception of the keys, but since the confession of Peter could be rewarded in six hundred ways, it pleased Christ to make it with the donation of the keys. And we see something like this in the example of Abraham, because Abraham by his faith not only was justified, but also merited to become the father of many nations, as the Apostle says in the same place, but not everyone who believes is the father of many nations. Indeed, faith is not per se and naturally connected with the gift of the keys, or of fecundity, as it is per se and naturally connected with justification.

The fifth objection. When Peter died, the keys either remained in the Church, or they perished with Peter. If the first, then they were given to the Church; if the second, then men can no longer bind and loose.

Similarly in another way: when a new Pontiff is elected, either he brings the keys with himself, or he does not. If the first, then he was the Pontiff before he was chosen; if the second, then whence does he have the keys? Are they given to him by an angel from heaven? Or does he receive them from the Church, to which they had been given by Christ at the beginning?

I respond that when the Pontiff dies the keys do not perish, nor do they remain formally in the Church, except inasmuch as they have been communicated to lower ministers, but remain in the hands of Christ. But when a new Pontiff is elected, the keys are not brought to the office by himself, nor are they given to him by the Church, but by Christ, not by a new handing on, but by an ancient institution: because when he gave them to Peter, he gave them to all his successors.

The sixth objection is that of Luther and Calvin. In the passages formerly cited concerning Matt. 16:19, the keys of the kingdom of heaven are not given, but promised; they are actually given in Matt. 18:18 and John 20:22-23, in which places they are given not to Peter alone, but to all the Apostles. For, in Matt. 18:18 it is said: *Whatever you bind*

on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatever you loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven. And in John 20:22-23: *Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, they are forgiven; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained.* Therefore also when they are promised, they are promised not to one, but to all.

I respond that there is no difficulty with the second quote. For it is certain that by those words all the power of the keys is not given, but only the power of orders for the remission of sins. If indeed in this place the power over sins is determined, in Matt. 16:19 it is not determined, but it is said: *Whatever you bind, etc.,* but men are bound not only by sins, but also by laws. Then it is a smaller thing to retain sin than it is to bind the sinner, for, to retain is to leave the man in his same state, or not to set him loose. But to bind is to impose a new bond on him, which takes place through an excommunication, interdict, law, etc. Finally, the Fathers say clearly that here is given the power of forgiving sins through the sacraments of Baptism and Penance. See Chrysostom and Cyril on this place, and Jerome in his letter to Hedibia, question 9.

There is a greater difficulty with the first quote, and in fact Origen in his commentaiy on this place says that ecclesiastical power is not being given here, but that fraternal correction is recommended; and that in this place he is loosed who is the cause of his own problem, like the sinner who had a change of heart and by the required penance is loosed from the bonds of his sins; but that he is bound, who is the cause of his own damnation, like the sinner who is held to be a Gentile or a Publican. But Origen adds in the same place that what is said here is not the same as what is said in Matt. 16:19; this explanation of Origen does not seem to be very probable, however from it one can clearly deduce that Origen in no way favors the Lutherans.

The explanation of Theophylact is different. He thinks that the words of the Lord are directed to those, who suffer an injury, but to bind them, when he retains the injury; to loose when they forgive, which is not completely true. For, either he who receives the injury, forgives the penitent or he does not forgive him; if the first, then indeed he will be loosed in heaven, but not because he forgives, for even if he did not want to forgive, he would be loosed in heaven; if the second, then he is not loosed in heaven. But the same thing can be said about the binding; and even if this opinion were true, still it would not hinder our thesis; for, it is certain that something else was given to Peter other than that he should forgive injuries done to himself. Therefore, it is the common explanation of Hilaiy, Jerome, Anselm, and other commentators on this place, and also of Augustine in tractates 22 and 49 on John that the Lord is speaking about the power of the keys, whereby the Apostles and their successors bind and absolve sinners.

And although here it seems that he is dealing principally about the power of jurisdiction, by which sinners are excommunicated, still the Fathers already mentioned explain this passage as being about both powers, namely, of Orders and jurisdiction. Certainly it seems from the text itself that that can be deduced. For, in a general way it is said here: *Whatever things you loose, etc.* Thus also in Matt. 16:19: *Whatever you loose.* But if this is the case, what answer shall we give to the adversaries? Is it not that what seemed to be promised to Peter alone, really is given to all the Apostles?

Thomas Cajetan in chapter 5 of his treatise on the institution and authority of the

Roman Pontiff teaches that the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the power of binding and loosing are not the same; the keys of the kingdom of heaven include both the power of Orders and jurisdiction, which are signified by the actions of binding and loosing; and something even more, since to open and to close seems to be something broader than to loose and to bind.

Truly this doctrine seems to us to be more subtle than true. For, in the Church it is unheard of that there are keys other than those of Orders and jurisdiction. And the plain sense of those words: *I will give you the keys, and whatever you loose on earth, etc,* is this—that first the authority or power designated by the keys, and then the actions or office are explained by the words "to loose and to bind," so that to loose and to open, and to close and to bind are absolutely the same. But the Lord expressed the actions of the keys by "to loose and to bind," not by "to close and to open," in order that we might understand that they are metaphorical sayings, and finally that both heaven is opened for men, and men are loosed from their sins, which impede a man's entrance into heaven.

Therefore, setting these opinion aside, we say that with those words which are given in Matt. 18:18 nothing is given, but only promised or explained or foretold concerning the great power that the Apostles and their successors were going to have in the future. For, it is clear that the Apostles were not made priests until the Last Supper, and they were not made bishops and pastors until after the resurrection; therefore, when Christ spoke these words to them they were private individuals, and they did not have any ecclesiastical authority.

Then, if with these words, *Whatever things (quaecumque) you bind shall be bound,* the power of binding is really given, also with those words, *Whatever (quodcumque) you bind will be bound,* the power will be given, not just promised; for, these words are totally similar. But the adversaries claim that by those words, *Whatever (quodcumque) you bind,* nothing was given, but only promised; therefore also by the words, *Whatever (quaecumque) you bind,* nothing is given, but only promised. But the reason for this promise was, because the Lord had said, that the man who does not listen to the Church should be taken for a Gentile or Publican; and lest anyone think that the authority of the Church should be contemned, he adds that the power of the bishops of the Church will be so great that what they bind on earth will also be bound in heaven.

You will say: if the keys were not given to the Apostles in this place, but only promised, when and where were they given? I respond that they were given in John 20 and 21. For, in John 20:21, when the Lord says, *Peace be with you. As the Father has sent me, even so I send you,* then he gave them the power or key of jurisdiction; for, with these words he made them his quasi legates, and rulers of the Church in his name. But with the following words, *Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive the sins of any, etc.,* he gave them the power of Orders, as we said above.

But so that we might understand that this supreme power was conferred on all the Apostles as legates, not as ordinary pastors, and with a certain subjection to Peter, he says to Peter alone in John 21:17, *Feed my sheep,* just as it had been said to him alone: *I will give you the keys.* For, the keys of the kingdom, as the principal and ordinary head, he receives only then, when he hears: *Feed my sheep.* For then also the care of his brother

Apostles was committed to him.

And also because of that, as in Matt. 16:17 at the promise of the keys he was called, *Simon Bar-Jona,* so also in the conferring in John 21:15 he is called, *Simon, son of John,* or, as it is in the Greek, *Simon of John.* And as in Matt. 16:19 the keys are not promised before he confesses his singular faith in Christ, so also in John 21:17, *Feed my sheep* was not said to him before he was asked whether he loved Christ more than the others, And surely there was no reason why it should be said to Peter in such a singular way: / *will give you the keys,* and, *Feed my Sheep*—and that because of his singular faith and love—if he was going to receive nothing besides the others. Rightly therefore St. Leo writes in letter 89 to the bishops of the province of Vienne that the power of binding and loosing was given to Peter before and above the others.

The last objection of Luther and Calvin is taken from the writings of the Fathers. For, St. Cyprian in his treatise on the unity of the Church teaches that the keys, which were given later to all, were given separately to Peter for no other reason than that the unity of the Church should be signified: *Assuredly the rest of the Apostles were also the same as was Peter, endowed with a like partnership both of honor and power; but the beginning proceeds from unity, and the primacy is given to Peter so that the one Church will be made known.* St. Hilary also in book 6 on the Trinity says this: *O you holy and blessed men, because of the merit of your faith you have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and you have received the power of binding and loosing in heaven and on earth, etc.*

St. Jerome in book 1 against Jovinianus said: *But you say the Church is built on Peter, although in another place it is said to be upon all the Apostles, and all of them receive, etc.* St. Augustine in tractate 50 on John said: *For if in Peter fr case there was not a sacrament of the Church, the Lord would not have said to him, I will give unto you the keys of the kingdom of heaven... if this was said only to Peter, it gives no ground of action to the Church. But if such is the case also in the Church... then Peter, in receiving the keys, represented the Church.* He has similar statements in the tractate on John 21. Likewise on Ps. 109 and in book 1, chapter 18 on the teaching of Christ, and in chapter 3 in the book on the agony of Christ. Finally, St. Leo in sermon 3 on the anniversary of his election as Pontiff, while explaining these words, *I will give you the keys, etc.,* said this: *He handed on the force of this power to the other Apostles, and the nature of this decree was communicated to all the leaders of the Church.*

I respond that St. Cyprian, when he says the Apostles were equal in honor and power, is not saying anything against our position; for, we admit that the Apostles were equal in apostolic power, and had absolutely the same power over the Christian peoples, but that they were not equal among themselves. This is what St. Leo says in letter 84 to Anastasius, the Bishop of Thessalonica, when he is explaining those words of Cyprian: *Among the blessed Apostles,* he said, *there was a certain distinction of power in the likeness of honor, and although the choice of all was equal, still it was given to one of them to preside over the others.*

St. Cyprian teaches this in the same place and elsewhere passim. For, when he says: *The beginning proceeds from unity, so that the one Church will be made known,* he does

not understand in the order of time that this power was given to Peter alone, rather than to the others, that through him the unity of the Church might be signified, but that the Church began in Peter, as on a foundation and head, so that because the Church has one foundation and head, she might be shown to be only one, just as a house is said to be one from its one foundation, and a body is one from one head.

But that this is the meaning of Cyprian's words is proved first of all from the fact that it is false that in the order of time ecclesiastical power was given to Peter before it was given to the others. For, in John 20:22-23 it was given to all, but later it was said to Peter alone: *Feed my sheep,* in 21:17. Therefore, that the beginning proceeds from one is not understood in the sense that the keys were given first to one Apostle, but that they were given to only one as the ordinary and first pastor and head of the others.

Then the same thing is proved from the words of Cyprian himself; for, in his book on the simple life, when explaining the unity of the Church and why it takes its beginning from the one Peter, he writes that the Church is one in the same way as all the rays of the sun are said to be one light, because they come from the one sun; and many streams become one body of water, because they come from the same fount; and many branches are one tree, because they all sprout out from one root.

In addition, Cyprian teaches in many places that this root and this fount, from which the unity of the Church is derived, is the See of Peter. In book 1, letter 3 to Cornelius he said: *They venture to go to the chair of Peter, and the principal Church, where sacerdotal union had its beginning.* What could be clearer than that? And in book 4, letter 8 to Cornelius, speaking about the chair of Peter: *We know,* he said, *that we have been exhorted to acknowledge and revere (that chair) as the mother and root of the Catholic Church.* And in the letter to Jubajan he said: *We hold that he is the head and root of one Church.* And after that, when explaining what the root is, he says: *For first of all the Lord gave that power to Peter, upon whom he built the Church, and on him he instituted and showed the origin of the whole.* And further on: *The Church which is one, by the word of the Lord was established on the one man who received its keys.* There you see clearly that the Church is said to be one, because it was founded on the one Peter.

Now regarding the testimony of Hilary, we admit that all the Apostles received the keys, but not in the same way as Peter did. Therefore Hilary writes in the same place that Peter, because he alone answered while all the other Apostles remained silent, for the confession of his faith was promised a preeminent place; therefore Peter had a preeminent place among the Apostles, if we believe Hilary; and concerning Matt. 16:19 he says especially about Peter: *O blessed doorkeeper of heaven, to whose judgment the keys to eternal life have been given.*

To Jerome I say that the answer is in the same place. For, Jerome says that all the Apostles have the keys so that they are still subject to Peter the head.

To Leo I say that he gave the authority of binding and loosing to many others, but still it was given principally to Peter. For, the same Leo says in the same place: *As you are founded on the very citadel of the Apostolic Rock, not only has our Lord Jesus Christ redeemed you in common with all men, but the blessed Apostle Peter has instructed you far beyond all men.* And in letter 89 to the bishops of the province of Vienne he said: *The*

power of binding and loosing was given to Peter above the others.

The testimonies of Augustine remain, and three things should be noted so that they may be explained carefully. First, Augustine, when he says that Peter took the part of the Church when he received the keys, means that he received them really and historically, not just metaphorically, so that in no way did he think it should be denied that Peter really in his own person received the keys. This is clear from the tractate on Ps. 109, which Luther objected to; for in that place Augustine says that Peter was a figure of the Church when he received the keys, just as Judas was a figure of the ungrateful Jews when he betrayed Christ. But it is certain historically that Judas really in person betrayed Christ

Similarly in the tractate on John 21 Augustine says that Peter took the part of the Church militant and the active life, when he heard, *Follow me,* and, *Another will gird you and carry you where you do not wish to go,* and when he received the keys of the kingdom, so also John took the part of the Church triumphant and of the contemplative life, when he rested on the breast of the Lord, and when it was said about him, *If it is my will that he remain until I come.* But it is certain that John historically and truly in his own person leaned on the breast of the Lord, and the words "If it is my will that he remain" were fulfilled literally, whether he died, or did not die a violent death, or something else is understood by those words. And it is no less certain that in his person Peter heard the words "Another will gird you..."; therefore it must also be understood historically that Peter received the keys.

Finally, in book 15, chapter 26 on the Trinity Augustine says that Christ took the part of the Church when he was baptized; nevertheless doubtless, truly and literally he was baptized; therefore in Augustine a historical narration is not excluded when one thing is said to be a type of something else.

But, you will say, Augustine in Ps. 109 seems to think that not eveiything said in the Psalm can be understood to be about the person of Judas; and therefore that it is necessary to explain many things about Judas—that he took the part of the wicked. And in his tractate on John 21 Augustine figuratively explains the things said about Peter and John, since they do not seem really to agree with their persons. For, it is written about Peter that he loved Christ more than John, and on the other hand it is written about John that he was loved by Christ more than Peter. Now these things cannot be literally true, since Christ is a just man, and he always loves those more by whom he is loved more. Therefore, when Augustine explains something about Peter as he plays the part of the person of the Church, he does it because he thinks that it does not really agree with Peter.

I respond that Augustine nowhere says that those things are not literally true that are said about Judas, or about Peter and John in the Scriptures. For, Augustine was not so ignorant or impious that he would wish to deny that John historically reclined on the breast of Christ; or that it was said literally about him, *This is the disciple whom Jesus loved;* QT that it was said literally to Peter, *Simon, son of John, do you love me more than these?* or the command, *Follow me.* Therefore, Augustine does not deny that what is said literally about Judas, Peter and John can and must not be understood literally, but he only says that the literal sense is often obscure, and is not easily found: however, he says that the mystical sense is much more enlightening and is clearer, and because of that, he

omitted the literal sense, and wanted to explain those places metaphorically.

Secondly, it should be observed that St. Augustine, when he says that St. Peter received the keys in the person of the Church, he does not wish to signify that the keys were received by him really and historically, as a vicar or legate of the Church, as the keys to some city are wont to be received by the legate of a king and in the name of his master, but rather he received them as the leader and director of the whole Church. In the same way we say that what is given to the king himself, is given to the kingdom, especially if it contributes to the public welfare.

However, that this is the mind and opinion of St. Augustine is clearly gathered from the fact that he says almost everywhere that Peter was figure or type of the Church, and he explains that he is saying this because of the primacy. So in his tractate on John 21 he said: *Peter the Apostle, because of the primacy of his apostolate, took the part of the Church generally in a figurative way.* And on Ps. 109 he said: *He is acknowledged to have taken the part of it (the Church) because of the primacy which he had over the disciples.* And in Sermon 13 on the word of the Lord: *Blessed Peter,* he said, *having been named after a rock, representing a figure or type of the Church, possessed the preeminence of the apostolate.*

Finally, it should be observed that Peter, because of his primacy, in two ways took the part of the Church according to Augustine. For, first of all, Peter as the supreme présider of the Church in receiving the keys signified that all the presiders were going to have the same keys, but from Peter, and not communicated without some limitation. For, Peter did not receive them so that only he would use them, but with the purpose that he should share them with all bishops and priests; however, the Apostles are excluded from this, because in a special way they received them immediately from Christ, as we have explained elsewhere.

Therefore, Peter was the figure or type of the whole assembly of ecclesiastical ministers, and this is what Augustine meant when he said in tractate 50 on John: *If this was said to Peter only, the Church does not do it; but if this happens in the Church, when Peter receives the keys, he signifies the whole Church.* Calvin deleted the word "only" from this place, in order to persuade us that nothing was said or given to Peter, except inasmuch as he signified the Church.

But Augustine does not say: if this was said to Peter, the Church does not have ίζ but he says: *If this was said to Peter only, etc.,* and the meaning of these words is: If it was so said to Peter only, *I will give you the keys,* that he alone should bind and loose, then it follows that the rest of the Church, that is, the other ministers do not have this. But if the others have this, as we see, certainly when Peter received the keys, he represented the whole Church.

In another way, the same Peter by receiving the keys was a figure or type of the whole holy Church, that is, of all the justified and living members or the body of Christ. For, St. Augustine, because of the Donatists, invented a new way of speaking about the keys and the remission of sins; for, besides the way of speaking, whereby we say that sins are remitted by priests in the administration of baptism and penance, which way of speaking he himself uses passim along with the other Fathers, he is accustomed also

frequently to say that sins are remitted by the charity of the Church, by the groans of the dove, by the prayers of the saints; and in this way that the keys of the kingdom are only of the just, and that this signified Peter when he received the keys.

In tractate 121 on John he said: *The love of the Church, which is poured into our hearts by the Holy Spirit, forgives the sins of its partakers; but it retains the sins of those who are not its partakers.* Likewise, in book 3, chapter 18 of his treatise on baptism he said: *Yet did they not confer remission of sins, which is granted through the prayer of the saints, that is, the groans of the dove, whoever it be that baptizes, if those to whom it is given belong to her peace. For the Lord would not say to robbers and usurers, "Whosesoever sins you remit, they shall be remitted to him; and whosesoever sins you retain, they shall be retained." Outside the Church, indeed, nothing can be either bound or loosed, since outside there is no one who can either bind or loose; but he is loosed who has made peace with the dove, and he is bound who is not at peace with the dove.* And in chapter 17: *For as regards the fact that to preserve the figure of unity the Lord gave the power to Peter that whatsoever he should loose on earth should be loosed, it is clear that that unity is also described as one dove without fault.* And after that: *By the prayers of the saints who are spiritual within them Church, as though by the frequent lamentations of the dove, a great sacrament is dispensed, with a secret administration of the mercy of God, so that their sins also are loosed who are baptized, not by the dove but by the hawk, if they come to that sacrament in the peace of Catholic unity.* You will find similar statements in book 5, chapter 21 on Baptism, and in book 7, chapter 51.

Moreover, by these words Augustine does not signify that the Church of the just remits sins by her authority, but that the sins are forgiven for no one, even though he is baptized or reconciled, unless the charity of the Church is extended to him, and he becomes a living member of the dove, and therefore a partaker of the prayers of the other just persons. For, by the prayers of the saints, like the groans of the dove, interior penance and charity is obtained, by which whoever are justified are formally justified.

St. Augustine invented this way of speaking because of the Donatists, to whom it seemed amazing that heretics could justify men through baptism, and bring them into the Church, since they themselves are burdened with sins and outside the Church. In order to remove this amazement, Augustine says that it is not so much he who baptizes who remits the sins, as it is the groans of the dove; since he who is baptized is not justified because he is baptized by this man or that man, but because through the baptism conferred by anyone the love of the Church is communicated to him.

CHAPTER XIII

WHAT IS UNDERSTOOD BY THE KEYS IN MATT. 16:19

The fourth question is—what are we to understand by the keys. For, Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 3 in his Institutes contends that the leadership of the Church was not given to Peter, even if it could be proved that the keys of the kingdom were given to him alone; and he proves it by the following reason.

The Lord explained the meaning of binding and loosing in John 20:23, when he gave the Apostles the power of forgiving and retaining sins; for to loose is to forgive sins, to bind is to retain. But how sins are forgiven and retained Scripture teaches passim, since through the preaching of the gospel it testifies that men are enlightened and liberated from the perversity of vices. Thus Paul says in 2 Cor. 5:19-20: *He gave us the ministry of reconciliation... so we are ambassadors for Christ, God making his appeal through us. We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be reconciled to God.*

Therefore he is said to remit sins who, by proclaiming the gospel converts men to God; he is said to retain sins, who declares those, whom he sees to be obstinate, to be delivered over to everlasting punishment. From this it follows that to receive the keys of the kingdom of heaven is not to receive preeminence or power over others, but the plain and sole ministry of the word. Calvin says that this explanation is not cunning, not forced, not distorted, but genuine, flowing obvious.

The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 2, book 2, chapter 7, column 526, demonstrate the same thing with another reason, because, indeed, if the primacy with these words was given or promised to Peter, then the Apostles would not have had doubts later about which one of them was the greatest; for they asked about this in Matt. 18:1, Mark 9:34, Luke 9:46; 22:24. Moreover, the Lord at least would have responded: Do not dispute about this further, for I have constituted Peter as the préside. But the Lord said nothing like this; therefore, that promise of the keys does not establish any primacy.

However, we and all Catholics by the keys given to Peter understand supreme authority over the whole Church; and we confirm this with three reasons. First, by the metaphor of the keys, as it is wont to be understood in the Scriptures. Thus in Isa. 22:15 if. the deposition of one high priest is described, and the institution of another with these words: *Go to this steward, to Shebna, who is over the household, and say to him: what have you to do here?* And after that: *I will thrust you down from your office, and you will be cast down from your station. And in that day I will call my servant Eliakim the son of Hilkiah, and I will clothe him with your robe, and will bind your girdle on him, and will commit your authority to his hand; and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And I will place on his shoulder the key of the house of David; he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut, and none shall open.*

Here clearly by the keys it is not the remission of sins, or the ministry of the word, but ecclesiastical authority that is understood. What is said in Isa. 9:6 is also pertinent here: *The government will be upon his shoulder.* Therefore, the government is said to be placed on his shoulder, because the keys, whereby the authority is designated, customarily were

place on his shoulder. And whoever reads this about Christ in Rev. 3:7 cannot deny that by the keys the authority of Christ is signified: *These are the words of the holy one, the true one, who has the key of David, who opens and no one shall shut, who shuts and no one opens.*

In addition there is also a common custom of this, even in secular affairs: for, when cities are surrendered to some king, they give him the keys as a sign of their subjection, and the keys are usually handed over to the one installed as the steward of the house.

Secondly, it is proved from the words: *Whatever you shall bind, etc.* For, in the Scriptures he is said to bind who commands or who punishes. The Lord speaks about precepts in Matt. 23:4: *They bind heaven burdens,* he said, *hard to bear, and lay them on men's shoulders, etc.* About punishments in Matt. 18:18: *Whatever you bind on earth, etc.* For here, even Calvin admits, the Lord is speaking about the censure of excommunication; for, the Church binds those whom she punishes with the penalty of excommunication. We also generally say that men are obliged to keep the law, and also are required to undergo the punishment, if they do not keep it. However, he is said to loose who forgives sins, who liberates from a punishment, who dispenses from a law, from vows, from oaths, and from similar obligations. Therefore, since it is said to Peter in a general way: *Whatever you loose, etc.,* the power is given to him of commanding, punishing, dispensing, forgiving; so therefore he is the judge and governor of all those who are in the Church.

Thirdly, it is proved from the Fathers. For, Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew, when explaining this promise, says that the whole world was committed to Peter, and that he was made the pastor and head of the whole Church. And Gregory in book 4, chapter 32, said: *It is manifest to all who read the gospel that, by this word of the Lord, the care of the whole Church was given to St. Peter, the prince of all the Apostles.* And immediately he gives the reason for this, when he says: *Because it was said to him: I will give you the keys of the kingdom, etc.*

Next, it is also false that the forgiveness of sins is nothing other than preaching the gospel. And it is amazing that such an obvious explanation never occurred to any of the ancient Fathers, but occurred only to Calvin. Certainly Chiysostom and Cyril on this text of John, and Jerome in his letter to Hedibia, question 9, understand by the authority of forgiving sins the power of conferring the sacraments of baptism and penance, not the power of preaching. However, that preaching and baptizing are not the same is taught by Paul in 1 Cor. 1:17, where he says that he was sent, *not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.*

But to the reference to 2 Cor. 5:19-20 on the word of reconciliation, I respond that in that text by the word "reconciliation" preaching is indeed understood, but that Paul did not want to say that preaching suffices for reconciliation, but that by the preaching men would be moved to want to be reconciled to God; and afterwards this takes place through baptism and repentance, as is said in Acts 2:38. For, after his sermon Peter says: *Repeal and be baptized every one of you.* But he did not say that it is enough to have heard the sermon.

To the argument of the Magdeburgenses I respond that the Apostles did not

clearly understand the promise made to Peter, until after the resurrection of Christ; and nevertheless they did suspect that Peter perhaps had been constituted the chief of all, and so they argued among themselves. And it is not surprising that they did not understand, because the Lord had spoken metaphorically. But they were so dull that they really did not understand many other things he said to them. For, in Mark 9:9-10 the evangelist writes: *As they were coming down the mountain, he charged them to tell no one what they had seen, until the Son of man should have risen from the dead. So they kept the matter to themselves, questioning what the rising from the dead meant.*

But Origen, Chrysostom and Jerome in comments on Matt. 18 bear witness to the fact that, because of the suspicion which they had about the primacy of Peter, they did argue among themselves. And what the Magdeburgenses say is not true, namely, that the Lord had not said that Peter had already been designated as their leader. For, what is the meaning of these words in Luke 22:26: *Let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader* ἡγούμενος *as one who serves?* Did he not surely call one of them greater and the leader?

CHAPTER XIV

IT WAS SAID BY CHRIST TO PETER ALONE IN JOHN 21 : FEED MY SHEEP

Up to this point we have discussed the words of the Lord by which supreme authority in the Church was promised to the Apostle Peter. Now it will be necessary to consider the words by which that same power was given to the same Peter. Here are the words: *Simon son of John, feed my sheep.* For the explanation of these words three things must be demonstrated. First, "Feed my sheep" was said to Peter alone. Then we have to prove that by the word "feed" supreme ecclesiastical power was given to him. Finally, that by the words "my sheep" the whole Church of Christ was designated. The adversaries of course deny all of these points.

Now first of all we will prove that it was said to Peter alone: *Feed my sheep.* First, from the name, *Simon son of John.* For, only Peter was called by that name, and without any mystery, as we said above, in the very same way Christ names Peter and promises him the keys in Matt. 16:19, and when he commands him to feed his sheep in John 21:17. He does this so we will understand that the same thing is given in John 21 which had been promised in Matt. 16, and that it was given to the same Simon to whom it had been promised.

Secondly, it is proved from the words: *Do you love me more than these?* For, is "Feed my sheep" said to the one to whom it is said, "Do you love me more than these"? But it is evident that this is said to Peter alone, since with clear words the others are excluded by the comparison "more than these." In addition, it is not just any men who are excluded, but they are especially the Apostles; for, those then present with Peter were Nathanael, whom many think was Bartholomew, James, John, Thomas, and two other disciples- one of whom was probably Andrew; therefore "Feed my sheep" was said to Peter alone, and not to all the Apostles.

Thirdly, it is proved from the triple interrogation. For, from Cyril and Augustine and others in their comments on this text, we learn that Peter was asked three times whether he loved more than the others, because he had denied Christ three times; but only he denied him three times. Therefore, only he is questioned, and so it is said only to him "Feed my sheep."

Fourthly, it is proved from the words "Peter was grieved, etc." For, Peter was grieved for this reason, if we are to believe Chrysostom, because he feared lest he be mistaken when he said, *Yes, Lord; you know that I love you,* just as he was mistaken when he had said, *Even if I must die with you, I will not deny you.* But this reason for sadness applies to Peter alone who had denied the Lord; therefore only Peter grieved, and Christ is addressing only Peter when he says, *Feed my sheep.*

Fifthly, it is proved from the words: *When you are old, you will stretch out your hands, etc.* For "Feed my sheep" is said to the one for whom crucifixion is predicted. But death is predicted only for Peter and in his own person.

Sixthly, it is proved from the words: *What about this man?* and from the answer of the Lord: *What is that to you? Follow me.* For, Peter never would have asked what was

going to happen to John, if he thought that the Lord had said to all, *Feed my sheep;* and the Lord would not have said: *What is that to you? Follow me,* but he would have said "he will do the same as you do."

Seventhly, it is proved from the Fathers. For, besides Chrysostom, Cyril and Augustine on this place, who say that the "Feed" is said to the one who had denied him three times, Ambrose says the same thing regarding Luke 24 when he explains these words: *Therefore,* he said, *because alone of all the Apostles he confessed him, he is placed before all.* Likewise, Maximus in his sermon on Saints Peter and Paul: *Now it is necessary, I think,* he said, *that we mention their own special virtues. Here is Peter, to whom Christ, as he was about to ascend to the Father, committed the care of his little sheep and his lambs.* Therefore, this was proper and special for Peter. Similarly Leo in letter 89 to the bishops of the province of Vienne said: *When the power of binding and loosing had been given in the presence of the others, still the special care of feeding the sheep was entrusted to him.*

However, John Calvin offers a different argument in book 4, chapter 6 § 3. According to him, Peter exhorts his fellow elders in 1 Pet. 5:2 to feed the flock of God; therefore, either those words "feed the sheep" were said to all, or Peter certainly transferred his right to others.

I respond that Peter exhorted his fellow elders to tend the flock, not the whole flock, but a particular one; for he says: *Tend the flock of God that is in your charge.* Paul acted in the same way when, in Acts 20:28, he exhorts the Asian bishops to take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, and then immediately he adds: *in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians,* that is, not the whole flock simply, but only the whole flock that has been committed to you. Therefore, those words of Peter do not hinder that the general power of tending the whole flock of Christ was committed to Peter alone, and that he transferred his own full power to no one.

Then Augustine and Chrysostom can be cited as raising an objection. For, Augustine in chapter 30 of his book on the agony of Christ wrote: *Since it is said to him (Peter), it is said to all: Love me. Feed my sheep.* Chrysostom in book 2 on the priesthood, in trying to persuade Basil to accept the episcopate for which he was nominated, cites this text and says: *Then Basil will show his excellent speaking for Christ, if he feeds his flock, since it is written: If you love me, feed my sheep.* Therefore Chiysostom wants to apply those words of the Lord not to Peter alone, but to all bishops.

I respond: although these words properly and principally pertain to Peter alone, still they apply in some way to all bishops, because all who are called to work with Peter must imitate the role of Peter in feeding the flock. Therefore, what is said to the supreme pastor is also, in its own way and with due proportion, said to the other lesser pastors. And therefore the Lord, when about to make Peter the pastor of the Church, asked him whether he loved more than the others, in order to warn those, whose office it is to choose and install pastors, that they choose men for the episcopate who excel others in charity. And what Leo says in sermon 3 on the anniversary of his becoming a bishop can be applied to this point: *Therefore this is entrusted to Peter in a special way, because the nature of Peter is placed before all the rulers of the Church.*

CHAPTER XV

THE MEANING OF "FEED" (PASCE) IN JOHN 21

Now since it is certain that it is Peter to whom is said "Feed my sheep," it is necessary to find out what this word "feed" means in this context. For, Martin Luther in his book on the power of the pope contends that through the word "feed" no new power is given, but only that the office is imposed on Peter of loving, preaching and teaching; he had already been constituted before as an Apostle and pastor, not indeed of the whole Church, but of a certain part, just like the other Apostles and pastors. Then he proves his point with these reasons.

First. To feed *(pascere)* does not mean to preside, but to offer food and serve, which can also be done by an inferior. Therefore, he is not immediately constituted as the leader to whom it is said "feed." Then, the Lord does not command Christians to obey Peter, but he commands Peter to provide sustenance for Christians; therefore a servant, not a leader is constituted by this word "feed." Lastly, if by these words a pontificate were instituted, it would follow that they are not pontiffs, who do not love, or who do not feed; hence often we would have no pontiff; for the greater part of pontiffs neither love the flock, nor feed them by word and example. Therefore by this word "feed" the institution of a pontiff is not contained, but it is only a simple precept of loving and teaching.

Now it will not be difficult for us to demonstrate from this very word "feed" that supreme power is to be attributed to the one to whom it is said: *Feed my sheep.*

For, first of all, he is not properly said to feed another, who serves food in any way whatsoever, but it is the one who procures and provides food for another, which certainly is the duty of a leader or governor: *Who then is the faithful and wise steward,* the Lord said in Luke 12:42, *whom the master set over his household, to give them their portion of food at the proper time?* Therefore it is the task of him to provide the food, who is set over the household.

Then by the word "feed" from the common use of the way people speak every pastoral act is understood. For, it is the same thing to feed, to take the part of a shepherd, or to be a shepherd. Next, a pastoral action is not only to provide food, but also to lead, to bring back, to protect, to go before, to rule, to rebuke. Do the shepherds of sheep only find food for them? Do they not also govern them, and with a rod force them to obey? Hence in the Scriptures "to feed" is understood passim for the fact that someone rules others, as in Ps. 2:9, where we read: *You shall break them with a rod of iron.* In Hebrew it is œnn, that \s9*feed them.* And surely those who are ruled and fed with an iron rod cannot deny that their shepherd has real power; and then there is Isa. 44, where it is said to Cyrus ^n, that is, *you are my shepherd.* But in that place he is predicting a great kingdom for Cyrus, not the service of offering food.

Then, the same point can be proved more effectively from the word which John used in his Gospel. For, he wrote ποίμαινε, that is, "feed" by ruling and presiding. For, Homer also in book 2 of the Iliad often calls Agamemnon ποιμένα λαών, that is, shepherd of the peoples; and in Scripture where we read in Matt. 2:6: *For from you shall come a ruler who will govern my people Israel.* In Greek it is: ἐκ σοῦ ἐξελεύσεται ἡγούμενος, ὅσης

ποιμανεϊ τον λαόν του 'Ισραήλ.

And it should be noted, in Hebrew in chapter 5 of Micah, whom Matt, is quoting, it is not the word mn that signifies "to feed," but the verb which means to rule. Finally, in Rev. 19:15, where it is said: *He 'will rule them with a rod of iron,* the Greek is: και αύτος ποιμανεϊ αύτους έν ραβδω σιδηρω. Therefore, since ποιμαίνω does not mean "to feed" in eveiy context, but also to rule and to preside, and since it was said to Peter by the Lord, ποίμαινε τα πρόβατα, it manifestly follows that Peter was constituted leader and présider of the Church.

Finally, there are the testimonies of the ancient Fathers. Chrysostom in book 2 on the priesthood more than once calls the office committed to Peter a commanding one because of the word "feed," and he explains it by quoting Matt. 24:45: *He is the faithful and wise servant, whom his master has set over his household.* St. Augustine in his comments on the same place said: *the sheep are to befed,* that is, they are to be taught and governed. Also, Gregory in his book on pastoral care passim calls the pastors rulers, and pastoral care government, and indeed the summit of government; and he interprets "feeding" itself as meaning to rule and to preside.

And the weak reasons of Luther do not prove anything. Now the answer to the first one is: "to feed" is not the task of a waiter at table, but of a ruler. For, the lords are not fed by the servants, even though they carry the food to the tables of the lords, but rather the servants are said to be fed by the lords, because they live off the goods of the lords.

To the second reason I respond: to be over and to be under, to rule and to be ruled, to feed and to be fed have a certain relation to each other, so that one cannot exist without the other. Therefore, by the word said to Peter that he should preside, govern and feed—by that same word we are commanded to be subject to Peter, and to allow ourselves to be ruled and to be fed by him.

To the third reason I respond that "feed" is indeed a precept, but that the ecclesiastical authority was instituted by that precept. For, by that act the power is signified from which that act proceeds. As when God says: *Let the earth bringforth living creatures;* and to the animals, *Befruitful and multiply,* he attributes fecundity to things, and he creates natures capable of generating. Not only God, but also men by a word of command are wont to establish rulers. For, if a king says to someone: "Go, govern that province," everyone understands that he has been constituted the governor of that province.

But, says Luther: if by that precept the pontificate is instituted, then he ceases to be pontiff, who ceases to carry out the precept. I respond that by those words of the precept the pontificate is so instituted that the conferred power does not depend on the observation of the precept. We see this same thing in human affairs; for, a king's officer does not cease to be his officer, as long as he is not recalled by the king, even if he does not govern the province correctly.

Then what Luther assumes is not true, namely, that the Roman Pontiffs for a long time have not tended the flock. For, although several of them do not preach, nevertheless they perform many other pastoral duties, while they bind, loose, dispense, judge disputes, create bishops, and what they do not do by their own preaching, they do through others. There is the example of Valerius, the bishop of Hippo, and some others, having been impeded by old age or lack of speech, they carried out the office of preaching through their priests.

CHAPTER XVI

BY THE WORDS "MY SHEEP" IN JOHN 21 THE WHOLE CHURCH IS SIGNIFIED

Now we will consider the third question: whether by the words "my sheep" the whole Church is understood. All Lutherans deny it, and especially Luther in his book on the power of the pope; Illyricus in his book against the primacy of the pope; the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 7, col. 525; the Smalkaldic book on the primacy of the pope, and Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 7 in his Institutes.

But we are convinced and certain that absolutely all Christians, including the Apostles, were entrusted to Peter like little sheep, since it was said to him: *Feed my sheep.*

However, it is to be observed that Christ said twice, *Feed my lambs,* and he said once, *Feed my sheep.* Although in the Greek text, *Feed my lambs* occurs once, and Feed *my sheep* occurs twice, nevertheless this passage seems to have been corrupted by an error of the scribes, who in the second place wrote πρόβατα, when they should have written προβάτια, that is, *little sheep* or *lambs.* For it was easy to omit one *iota.*

That such is the case I gather first from Ambrose and Maximus. For, Ambrose on Luke 24 says that Christ commended the *lambs* to Jesus, in Greek ἀρνία. In the second place was *little sheep,* which are called in Greek προβάτια. In the third place it is *sheep,* in Greek πρόβατα. Maximus in his sermon on Saints Peter and Paul says that the *little sheep* and the *sheep* were commended to him; and certainly he would not have said this, unless he read προβάτια and πρόβατα. Then I deduce the same thing from our version; for, if it were said twice in Greek, πρόβατα, not even the most uneducated boy would have translated it in the second place as *lambs:* for, who does not know that not πρόβατα, but ἀρνία means *lambs?*

Therefore, since all the Latin codices read *lambs,* and since this reading was never challenged by Jerome or by anyone else, then it is necessary to say that the translator read προβάτια, that is, *little sheep,* and translated it as *lambs,* because "little sheep" and "lambs" are often taken for the same thing.

That being the case, from this variation, which does not seem to lack a certain mystery, we prove that all Christians are subject to Peter. For, if by "little sheep" we understand "lambs," we will say that lambs are repeated twice in order to signify two peoples—Jews and Gentiles, but that the "sheep" mentioned once signify the bishops, who are like the mothers of the lambs. Therefore, the Lord committed to Peter the care of the *lambs,* that is, the Jewish people, and of the *lambs,* that is, the Gentile people, and of the *sheep,* that is, of those who gave birth to those lambs in Christ, who are the Apostles and bishops.

But if by the word "oviculas" we understand small sheep larger than lambs, but not yet perfect sheep, it will have to be said with St. Ambrose, in the place cited, that to Peter are committed the *lambs, little sheep* and *sheep,* that is, beginners, advanced, perfect, so that there are none in the Church, no matter how spiritual, learned and holy, who are not subject to Peter. Or, by *lambs* we will understand the peoples, who have no pastoral care, and who are only children and not parents. By *little sheep* we will understand ordinal)' priests, that is, vicars and pastors, who are parents of peoples in such a way that they are

the sons of the bishops. And by *sheep,* finally, we will interpret it to mean the bishops, who preside over both the lambs and the little sheep; nevertheless, they also are subject to Peter. And it seems that St. Leo had this in mind, when he said in sermon 3 on the anniversaiy of his becoming a bishop, that Peter was put in charge by Christ of all the Gentiles, all the Fathers and all the Apostles: for, the Gentiles are the lambs, the Fathers are the little sheep, the Apostles are the large and perfect sheep.

Next, the pronoun "my" provides us with another reason—and one that is significant. For, since without any restriction the pronoun *my* is added to the noun *sheep,* clearly it means that all those *sheep* are commended to Peter, which are included in the pronoun *my.* But it is certain that the "my" simply includes all; for, there is no one in the Church, who is not happy to be a sheep of Christ; therefore, the Lord commended all Christians, with no exception, to Peter.

And we see that similar expressions passim are used by the people. For, anyone who says, fam *leaving my goods to my children,* doubtless is not excluding any of his goods or any of his children. And when the Lord says in John 10:14-15:*I know my sheep, and my sheep hear my voice, and I lay down my life for the sheep,* and although he does not say, *"all the sheep," nevertheless no one can deny that he was speaking about all.*

Furthermore, what else does it mean to say, *Feed my sheep,* but, *Take care of my flock!* But there is only one flock according to John 10:16: *There shall be one flock and one shepherd.* Therefore Christ committed his whole flock to Peter.

Concerning this point, when the Lord says, *Feed my sheep,* either he commended to Peter all his sheep, or none, or certain definite ones, or some indefinite ones. But no one will say that he commended none or only some certain ones, since that is manifestly false; nor was it some indefinite ones, because it is not the mark of a wise provider to leave things indefinite, when he could be definite, especially since a certain confusion and disturbance would result from such indetermination.

Moreover, to commend some, and not to indicate whom, seems to be the same thing as commending no one. For whom, I ask, does he feed, who does not know his own flock? Therefore the conclusion is that Christ assigned absolutely all of his sheep to Peter so that he would feed them.

And this is the opinion of all the old Fathers. Epiphanius in Ancoratus said: *He is the one who hears, "Feed my sheep," to whom the flock has been entrusted.* But that there is only one flock of Christ, we have already proved from the gospel. John Chrysostom on this place said: *Having passed over the others, he addresses Peter only and confers on him the care of his brothers.* And after that: *For,* he said, *since he had communicated great things to Peter, he put him in charge of the whole world.*

Ambrose, in his comments on Luke 24, says that the Lord with these words, *Feed my sheep,* gave to us Peter as the vicar of his love: *Having ascended into heaven,* he said, *he left him as his vicar.* He did that so that we might have Peter, who would care for us with paternal and pastoral love, just as Christ himself did. And in the same place he also said: *Because he alone of all the Apostles made his confession, he was placed before all.*

Leo in sermon 3 on the assumption of his pontificate said this: *Out of the whole world the one Peter is chosen, who is placed before the call of all the nations, and all the*

Apostles and all the Fathers of the Church, so that although in the people of God there are many priests, and many pastors, nevertheless Peter really rules all, whom Christ also rules principally. Gregory in book 4, letter 32, when he said that the care of the whole Church had been entrusted to Peter, gave this reason, saying: *Because it was said to him—Feed my sheep.*

Theophylact said with regard to John 21 : *When the meal was finished, he commended to Peter the direction of the sheep of the whole world—and he gave it to him, not to anyone else.* And on Luke 22 he said: *You, Peter, after you have repented, will be a good example of repentance for all; although you were an Apostle, and denied me, you will again receive the primacy over all, and dominion over the world.* Bernard in book 2 on Consideration said: *To him, I say, were not absolutely all the sheep committed, not just the bishops but also the Apostles? If you love me, Peter, feed my sheep. Which ones? The people of this or that city, or region, or certain kingdom? My sheep, he said.* To whom is it not evident that he did not designate some, but that he assigned all? Nothing is excluded, where nothing is designated.

Now we will refute the arguments of the adversaries. The first objection is that of Luther. Christ does not say, *Feed all my sheep,* as he had said in another place: *Teach all nations;* therefore he did not commit all his sheep to Peter to be fed. I respond that the pronoun "my" is equal to a universal sign, as we demonstrated above.

The second objection is that of the same Luther and also of Illyricus. The care of shepherding all the sheep was committed to Peter; therefore Peter had to care for all the sheep, but he himself did not do this; for, the other Apostles cared for their own part of the Lord's flock, and they were not sent by Peter, but by Christ. I respond that St. Peter, partly by himself and partly by others, shepherded the whole flock of the Lord, which had been committed to him. For, although the Lord sent out all the Apostles to preach and to shepherd his flock, nevertheless by this fact, that he had committed their care (as Chrysostom says) to Peter, what they did, Peter did through them, upon whom they depended as on their head and commander.

The third common objection is from Luther with others, whose place we mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. The Apostle Paul in Gal. 2 acknowledges no subjection to Peter, or James, or John: *To them,* he said, *we did not yield subjection even for a moment.* Likewise: *What they were makes no difference to me.* Likewise: *Those who were of repute added nothing to me.* Likewise: *They gave me the right hand of fellowship.*

I respond that the proposal of Paul in Gal. was not to show that he was not subject to Peter, which pertains to the government; for he makes no mention of this. But he says that his gospel is just as true and divine, and received immediately from Christ himself, as the gospel of Peter and James and John. For, his point was that the false brethren had claimed that Peter, James and John were taught by Christ, but that Paul was the disciple of men; and therefore that their gospel should be considered of more value than that of Paul.

Therefore, Paul begins his letter against the calumnies of these false brethren in this way: *Paul an apostle—not from men nor through man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.* And after that: *For I would have you know that the gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught*

it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ.

And pertinent here are the words: *Those who were of repute added nothing to me.* For, Paul is signifying with these words that he received none of his teaching from the other Apostles, but that he was diligently instructed about everything by Christ. But he does add this: *They gave me the right hand of fellowship.* Indeed he compels us to believe that Peter and Paul were companions in the office of preaching, but he is not hindering us from understanding that Peter was greater than Paul in the office of governing. For, also in 1 Sam. 23:25 Scripture says: *Saul and his men went to seek him;* however, the same Scripture makes Saul the king, and the others his servants.

But this sentence: *But to them we did not yield subjection even for a moment,* does not refer to Peter and James, but to the false brethren. For, we also read this: *But because of false brethren secretly brought in, who slipped in to spy out our freedom which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage—to them we did not yield subjection even for a moment.*

Then there is this: *And from those who were reputed to be something, what they were makes no difference to me;* it is not said in contempt of Peter and John, as the Smalkaldic book said, but for their praise and honor. For, Paul is giving the reason why he wanted to confer about his gospel with the Apostles who were in Jerusalem, although they were at one time unskilled men and common fishermen. And he says that it made no difference to him, what kind of men they were formerly, since God is not a respecter of persons, but assists those who now are seen to be, by the grace of God, great apostles and pillars of the Church.

Finally there is this: *Those who were of repute gave me no commands.* The Smalkaldic Synod of Lutherans uses these words, and from there they were placed in their book on the primacy of the Pope, but it is certain that they are not to be found in Paul. But this is an amazing familiarity, which the adversaries have with God, namely, that they brazenly add to his word, and do not fear the punishments, which God threatens to impose on those who add to his word.

The fourth objection of the same persons. The Apostle in Gal. 2 teaches that, by divine and human right, jurisdiction has been divided between Peter and Paul, and the Jewish people have been allotted to Peter, and the Gentiles to Paul. Therefore, not all of Christ's sheep have been committed to the care of Peter. These are the words of the Apostle: *When they saw,* he said, *that I had been entrusted with the gospel to the uncircumcised, just as Peter had been entrusted with the gospel to the circumcised (for he who worked through Peter for the mission to the circumcised worked through me also for the Gentiles), they gave to me and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship, that we should go to the Gentiles and they to the circumcised.* Therefore the apostolate of Peter does not pertain to us, because we are Gentiles.

I respond that the division about which Paul is speaking in the letter to the Galatians is not of jurisdiction, but of provinces, so that the gospel of Christ can be preached more effectively. For, although all the Apostles could preach the gospel in the whole world, still so that it could be done more quickly and easily, a twofold distribution of the provinces among the Apostles was made: one among the twelve Apostles who, as Eusebius says, by citing Origen, in book 3, chapter 1 of his History, divided the provinces

among themselves so that Andrew went to Scythia, Thomas to Parthia, John to Asia, and the others went to different places to preach the gospel of Christ.

Another distribution was made between Peter and Paul, that is, Peter worked mainly for the conversion of the Jews, but he was not hindered from the conversion of the Gentiles. On the other hand, Paul worked especially for the conversion of the Gentiles, but he did not totally refrain from the conversion of the Hebrews. We will confirm all of this easily from the divine writings.

First, that Peter was free to preach to the Gentiles, although he was the Apostle of the Jews, is certain from many places in Scripture. For, he preached to Cornelius and his whole household, as reported in Acts 10, and he speaks about this in Acts 15:7: *You know that in the early days God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe.* Finally, in Matt. 28:19-20 the Lord said to all the Apostles: *Therefore go, and teach all nations.* And in Mark 16:15: *Preach the gospel to the whole creation.* Therefore by divine right all the Apostles could preach to all the nations; and certainly the prince of the Apostles was not excluded from the right that was given to all the Apostles.

Moreover, Innocent I in letter 1, chapter 2 of his letter to Decentius teaches that in all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa and Sicily Churches were established by Peter, or by those whom he or his successors had sent. And it cannot be denied that these Churches were composed mainly of Gentiles.

Finally, if Peter was the Apostle only of the Jews, and not of the Gentiles, why did he not locate the seat of his episcopacy in Jerusalem, which was the metropolis of the Jews, but he placed it first in Antioch in Syria, and then in Rome, which were Gentile cities? And why did the Gentiles, who were in Antioch, not present their questions about the law to Paul, who was the Apostle of the Gentiles, but to Peter and James, who were Apostles of the Jews?

Now it can be seen clearly from his actions that Paul evangelized the Jews, although his main commitment was for the salvation of Gentiles. For, wherever he went, he preached the gospel in the synagogues of the Jews. In Acts 13 he preaches in the synagogue of the Jews at Salamis, and Antioch of Pisidia; in Acts 14 at Iconium; in Acts 17 at Thessalonica; in Acts 18 at Corinth and Ephesus; and in Acts 28 at Rome he announces the gospel first of all to the Jews. In 1 Cor. 9:20 he says: *To the Jews I became as a Jew, in order to win Jews.* Finally, he writes to the Hebrews because of his concern for them, and in 2 Cor. 11:28 he says that he is solicitous for all the Churches, and if all, then certainly for the Hebrews.

Therefore by divine right both Peter and Paul could preach to all, both Jews and Gentiles. But because Paul was the Apostle principally of the Gentiles, it is because the Lord says about him in Acts 9:15: *He is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles and kings and sons of Israel.* There the sons of Israel are put in the last place. However, to Peter with the other Apostles it is said in Acts 1:8: *You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth.* There the Jews are put in the first place, and the Gentiles in the last place.

Therefore, this is what Paul says in Gal. 2:7 that Peter was the Apostle of the circumcised, but he of the uncircumcised. And this is how Jerome explains this text,

where the question is asked: Whether Peter was permitted to bring the Gentiles to the Faith, and Paul the Jews? He responds that it is permitted absolutely; indeed he says it was proposed to both that they should establish Churches throughout the world. However, Peter's principal mandate concerned the Jews, and Paul's was the Gentiles.

Furthermore, it should be observed that Peter's task was the more honorable than Paul's, since the Lord by himself wanted to preach to the Jews, but by his disciples to the Gentiles. Thus, in Matt. 15:24 the Lord says: *I was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.* And the Apostle says in Rom. 15:8: *Christ became a servant to the circumcised.* The same Paul in Rom. 11:17ff. compares the Jews to an olive tree, and the Gentiles to a wild olive shoot to be grafted in the good olive tree in order to share in its richness.

The fifth objection. The Apostle Paul in chapter 2:11 of the same letter to the Galatians says that he resisted Peter to his face. Therefore, he was not subject to him, but he was either superior or certainly an equal; therefore not all the sheep of Christ are subject to Peter.

I respond: I know that Clement of Alexandria, as reported in book 1, chapter 14 of Eusebius's History, says that not Peter the Apostle, but some other person was reprimanded by Paul. I know also that Jerome, and many others, say that Peter was not reprimanded truly, but only apparently. But Augustine's opinion is more probable—that Peter was seriously reprimanded; I think it is permitted for a subject to reprimand his superior, provided that the situation requires it and that it is done with due reverence.

Therefore, Cyprian in his letter to Quintus: he praises the humility of Peter, because being reprimanded by Paul, he did not say that he had the primacy, and that he should be obeyed by newcomers. There he points out that Peter was reprimanded by an inferior. And Augustine in letter 19 to Jerome says this: *Peter gave a rare and very holy example to posterity—that they should not disdain being corrected by inferiors, as Paul corrected Peter, so that inferiors may confidently resist their superiors in defense of the truth, but always done with charity.*

Also Gregory in homily 18 on Ezekiel said: *He also gave himself to a lower brother for his agreement, and in the same matter he followed the view of the inferior, so that he might precede him in this matter, inasmuch as the one who was first in the leadership of the apostolate would be first also in humility.* And after that: *Behold, he is reprimanded by an inferior, and he does not scorn being reprimanded.*

The sixth objection. The Apostles, without any command from Peter, establish the deacons in Acts 6. Also, they send Peter himself to Samaria in Acts 8; therefore, Peter was not the head and pastor of the Apostles, but rather he was subject to their command. Moreover, in Acts 10 Peter has hesitations about whether or not he is allowed to evangelize the Gentiles, and because he did it, he is rebuked by the other disciples in Acts 11. Therefore who can readily believe that the Gentiles were part of his flock?

I respond: first of all, there is nothing contrary to the primacy of Peter in the fact that all the Apostles, taking counsel together, decided to install deacons. For, it is to be believe that it was done under the authority of Peter, or certainly with his consent. But it would only derogate from his primacy, if it could be proved that it was done without his knowledge or against his will.

Now concerning the mission of Peter and Paul, as reported in Acts 8.1 respond that the word "mission" does not necessarily signify subjection in the one who is sent. For, whoever authorizes someone else to go, is said to send him, whether he does it with a command, as a lord sends his servants as is said in John 13:16, *A servant is not greater than his master,* or by counsel and persuasion, as an equal sometimes sends an equal, or an inferior his superior. For, in Matt. 2:8 Herod sends the Magi to Bethlehem, but he had no authority over them; and the Jewish people in Josh. 22:13 sent the priest Phinehasto the sons of Reuben and Gad, when, however, by divine law the high priest presided over all the people, as the Magdeburgenses say. Therefore, after consulting and persuading, the Apostles sent Peter to the Samaritans, because it was a very important matter—to confirm a new people in the faith.

Regarding what is said in Acts 10 and 11,1 say that many are deceived because they think Peter did not know that he should preach to the Gentiles, until he received the revelation in chapter 11. But that is absurd, since in Mark 16 and Matt. 28 the Apostles are ordered to teach all nations, and lest anyone should say that the Apostles did not understand this, Luke says in 24:45: *Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures.* And immediately he adds this, explaining which Scriptures: *Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance should be preached in his name to all nations.* And Peter in Acts 1,2 and 3 passim shows that he understood the Scriptures, quoting the Psalms, Joel, Deuteronomy, and explicitly these words from Gen. 22:18: *By your descendants shall all the nations of the earth bless themselves.*

Therefore, Peter sees that vision, partly for himself, partly for others; for himself, not to learn that he can preach to the Gentiles, but to understand that now is the time to preach to them. For, the Lord had said in Acts 1:8: *You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth.* With these words he gave the order to the Apostles that they should preach first in Jerusalem, then in the rest of Judea, then in Samaria, and finally in the regions of the Gentiles. Therefore Peter was undecided about when he should preach to the Gentiles, and whether he should do it if the occasion offered itself, before he had preached throughout Judea and Samaria. The Holy Spirit removed this doubt by showing him that vision.

Accordingly, Cyril in book 9 against Julianus, while explaining this vision, said: *Peter understood immediately that the time had arrived to transform darkness into truth.* But Peter saw that vision for the sake of others, because there were many converts among the Pharisees who thought that it was not necessary to preach to the Gentiles, and who were going to point this out to Peter, if he preached to Cornelius, which is what they did later in Acts 11.

Therefore, so that Peter might have an excellent reason to refute a reprimand of this kind, God gave him this vision, as Chrysostom rightly explains it in homily 42 on Matthew: *He said this for the sake of others, and in order to prepare a response to his accusers.* And in his comments on Acts 10 he said: *Was Peter afraid to eat? By no means, but he says that by a divine dispensation all of this was done for the sake of those who were going to reprimand him.*

CHAPTER XVII

THE FIRST PREROGATIVE OF PETER IS EXPLAINED FROM THE CHANGE OF HIS NAME

Until now we have considered what pertained to the promise and the institution of the primacy of Peter; now we will present the singular and various prerogatives of Peter in order to confirm that primacy. But we will do this all the more willingly, because the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 10, col. 558ff, have carefully enumerated fifteen sins, and horrible lapses (as they say) of St. Peter, which they say are present in the divine writings by the divine will, lest we attribute too much importance to Peter.

Except for the denial of Christ which certainly was a very grave sin, the other fourteen, are not horrible sins of St. Peter, but horrible lies and blasphemies of the Magdeburgenses, as we shall prove later. But in the meantime for the 14 false crimes we will adduce 28 of his true prerogatives.

Therefore, the first prerogative is the change of his name. For, in John 1 the Lord says to Peter: *You are Simon the son of John; you shall be called Cephas (which means Peter).* It is to be observed with Chrysostom in this place that God never imposes new names, unless it is for a veiy serious reason, and in order to signify privileges granted to those whose names are changed. This is the case with Abraham; since he was called Abram, that is, distinguished father, God changed it to 0ПІ3К, that is, father of a multitude in Gen. 17:5. With that name he signified that the man, who was old and who had an old, sterile wife, still by the gift of God was to be so changed that he became the father of many sons, or rather of nations and peoples.

Also, there is a twofold prerogative in this change of name from Simon to Peter. First, of all the Apostles he changed the name only of Peter. For, although in Mark 3:17 he imposed the name of "Boanerges" on the son of Zebedee, nevertheless that was something like a surname, rather than a proper name. Therefore, afterwards they are never called "Boanerges" by the evangelists, but only James and John, as they were called before. But after that, Peter is almost always called Peter; and Paul in Gal. 2 often names him Peter, and never anything other than Peter or Cephas, which is the same thing; also, he names John often, but always John, never Boanerges.

The second prerogative is that he gave him such a name; for, in Aramaic Cephas means rock, as we explained above, and Jerome affirms this in his comments on Gal. 2. But in Greek it means "head," as Optatus noted in book 2 against Parmenius. It is also one of the most famous names of Christ, because in Scripture Christ is often called the rock. See, for example, Isa. 8:14 and 28:16, Dan. 2:34, Ps. 118, Matt. 21:42, Rom. 9:33, 1 Cor. 10:4, Eph. 2:20, 1 Pet. 2:8 and elsewhere. Therefore, Christ shares his own name only with Peter, and the name by which he is signified as the foundation and head of the whole Church. What else did he want to signify except that he was making Peter the foundation and head of the Church in place of himself?

Therefore Leo in letter 89 to the bishops of the province of Vienne rightly said: *He wanted him, who had been taken into fellowship with himself to be named what he was, saying: You are Peter, etc.* And in sermon 2 on the anniversary of his becoming Pontiff,

he introduces Christ speaking to Peter in the following way: *As the Father manifested my divinity to you, so also I am making known to you your excellence, because you are Peter, that is, since I am an inviolable rock, I am the cornerstone, who make both one, I am the foundation, in place of which no one can place another; still you also are the rock, because you are made firm by my power, so that the things belonging to my power are communicated to you because of your participation with me.*

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SECOND PREROGATIVE IS EXPLAINED FROM THE WAY IN WHICH THE APOSTLES ARE NAMED BY THE EVANGELISTS

Another prerogative of Peter is that, when the Apostles are named by the Evangelists, either all or just some of them, Peter is always put in the first place. For example, in Matt. 10:2: *The names of the twelve apostles are these: first, Simon, who is called Peter, etc.* We read the same thing in Mark 3:16, Luke 6:14, Acts 1:13. But that this was not done because Peter was the first one called by Christ is certain; for, the Lord called Andrew first, as John says in 1:40.

But the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 7, col. 524 say that Peter is mentioned first either because of his outstanding gifts, or because of his age, because he was the senior man, not because he was the head of the others; but in their chapter 10, col. 561 they write that it happened by chance that Peter was placed first in the list; for, someone had to be named first and Peter appeared there just by chance.

But not one of these reasons has any validity. Not the first one, for either they are talking about the outstanding gifts that Peter had in reference to the Church, as that he alone received the keys, that he was made the foundation of the Church, that he was constituted shepherd of all Christ's sheep, etc. and then they are speaking in our favor; or they are talking about his own personal gifts, that is, about his virtues; and then what they say is false. For the Evangelist could not easily know, nor would he have dared to judge, who was the best among the Apostles, especially since he knew that John was a virgin, Peter was married, and since he saw that the same John was so loved by the Lord that he was called, *the disciple whom Jesus loved.* Nor was he ignorant of the fact that James the Less was endowed with such holiness that he was called by all a just man and the brother of the Lord.

And what they say about age conflicts with the tradition of the old Fathers. For, Epiphanius in Heresies 51 said this: *The meeting with Andrew happened first, and Peter was younger than he in age.* Now Jerome in book 1 against Jovinianus says that John was not chosen as head of the others, because he was almost a boy; but he does not say that Peter was older than all. In addition, there is what the Magdeburgenses say in Centuries 1» book, 2, chapter 10 about the life of Andrew, namely, they say it is probable that Andrew was older than Peter.

But it did not happen by chance, because someone had to be placed first in the list, and it happened to be Peter; rather, Peter was placed first because of his dignity and this is evident for two reasons. First, from the way of listing them, for Matthew calls Peter first by name, then he does not say that one is second, another is third, etc., but he names them without any particular order.

Therefore, Matthew teaches that there is a certain order between Peter and the others, because Peter is higher and the others are lower, as Albert the Great rightly said in his comments on this point; and from the word "first" the Fathers deduce the primacy of Peter, which word the heretics hate very much. For, as from prince comes preeminence,

from consul consulship, so from first *(primo)* comes primacy. Hence Ambrose says regarding 2 Cor. 12: *Andrew followed the Savior before Peter did, nevertheless Andrew did not receive the primacy, but Peter did.* And Augustine in his tractate on John 21 said: *Peter, because of the primacy of his apostolate, etc.* Certainly primacy is not attributed to someone who by chance is placed first in a list, but to one who justly and deservedly is named first because of his position and authority.

Secondly, the same thing is gathered from the fact that the order of the others generally is changed, but Peter is always put in the first place. For, in Matt. 10 Andrew is placed after Peter. In Mark 2, James is after Peter; in Luke 6 Andrew is listed after Peter, but the order of the others is changed. For, Matthew put Thomas before himself; Luke puts Matthew before Thomas, and Thaddaeus before Simon. In Acts 1 John is placed after Peter, and between the others there are many changes.

Similarly, where two or three Apostles are named, Peter is always placed first. In Mark 5:37 and Luke 8:51 : *He allowed no one to follow him except Peter and James and John.* In Luke 22:8: *He sent Peter and John.* In Matt. 17:1 : *He took with him Peter and James and John.* In Mark 13:3: *Peter and James and John and Andrew asked him.* In John 21:2: *Simon Peter, and Thomas, and Nathanael, and the sons of Zebedee, and two others of his disciples were together.* You can see that everywhere Peter is first, which doubtless could not have taken place by chance.

There is only one place where Peter is not named first, namely, in Gal. 2:9, where it says: James, Cephas and John. But it is not certain as to whether Paul said this; for, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome in this place, both in the text and in the commentary read it as: Peter, James and John; and Chrysostom in his commentary on this place said: *Peter, James and John,* indicating that he read it in that order, and so it is credible that Paul wrote it in that order.

But if we admit that it must be read as: James, Peter and John, then it will be necessaiy to say, either, with St. Anselm and St. Thomas on this place that this was done because James was the bishop of Jerusalem, where the Apostles were then about whom Paul is speaking, or that Paul in this place did not observe any order.

For, that Paul elsewhere understands that Peter is greater than James is clear from the letter to the Galatians, where he says in 1:18: *Then after three years I went upto Jerusalem to visit Cephas.* He does not say, *I went to see James,* even though he also was in Jerusalem; and in 1 Cor. 1:12 he said: *Each one says, I belong to Paul, I to Apollo, I to Cephas, Ito Christ.* There clearly he proceeds by ascending, and he places Peter next to Christ.

But Peter is not only put in the first place, and called the first, but passim in the Scriptures he is described as the master of the house, as the leader, as the head of the rest For, as in Rev. 12:7 it is said—the devil and his angels; *Michael and his angels,* that is, the general and his soldiers: so it is said in Mark 1:36: *And Simon and those who wen with him followed him.* In Luke 8:45: *Peter said, and those who were with him.* Luke 9:32: *Peter and those who were with him.* In Mark 16:7: *Tell his disciples and Peter.* In Acts 2:14: *Peter, standing with the eleven.* In the same place: *They said to Peter and the rest of the apostles.* In Acts 5:29: *Peter and the apostles answered.* In 1 Cor. 9:5: *Do we*

not have the right to be accompanied by a wife, as the other apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas? Now I ask, was Cephas not a disciple? Was he not an apostle? Why therefore is it said—Peter and the apostles? The disciples and Peter? The apostles and Peter?—unless it was because Peter was the leader and the head of the others.

Therefore St. Ignatius in his letter to the Smymaeans says that Christ after the resurrection came to those who were around Peter. To the same prerogative pertains the fact that Peter almost always speaks in the name of all, as in Matt. 19:27: *Behold, we have left everything, etc.* And Luke 12:41 : *Are you telling this parable for us or for all?* And John 6:68: *Lord, to whom shall we go?* On this place Cyril writes as follows: *Through one who presided, all answered.* Hence also Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew calls Peter the mouth of the Apostles.

CHAPTER XIX

FOUR OTHER PREROGATIVES ARE EXPLAINED FROM THE GOSPEL OF ST. MATTHEW

The third prerogative is in Matt. 14:29, where only Peter together with the Lord walked on water. About this prerogative St. Bernard say this in book 2 on Consideration: *Like the Lord, walking over the waters, he designated him the only vicar of Christ, who must preside over not just one people but all peoples; since there are many waters, there are many peoples.* This is similar to what is narrated in John 21, where, while the other disciples in the boat were coming to the Lord, who was waiting for them on the shore, Peter threw himself into the water and swam to the shore. Concerning this, St. Bernard says in the same place: *What does this mean? Really, it is a sign of the singular authority of Peter, by which he receives for government not one boat, as each one of the others has his own, but the world itself; for the sea is the world, the ships are the Churches.*

The fourth prerogative is the special revelation made to Peter alone in Matt. 16, for it is an outstanding privilege that Peter, the first of all the Apostles and taught by God, knew the great mysteries of our Faith, namely, the distinction of persons in God and the Incarnation. For, although previously Christ was often called the Son of God, as in Matt. 14:33 when the disciples said, *Truly, you are the Son of God,* and in John 1:49 when Nathanael said, *You are the Son of God,* still they called Christ the Son of God in the way in which all the saints are called the sons of God. But Peter understood that Christ is the true and natural Son of God; this is clear both from the Greek text, where all the words are expressed with the definite article giving them emphasis: συ είς ό Χρίστος ό ύιος του Θεού ζωντος, and from the magnificent approval of Christ, when he says: *Blessed an you, Simon Bar-Jona! For flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven;* and also from the testimony of the ancient Fathers.

For Hilary on Ps. 132 calls Peter the first confessor of the Son of God, and in book 6 on the Trinity he says that Peter spoke what the human voice had not yet uttered. And on Matt. 16 he says that Peter was made worthy because he was the first to recognize that God is in Christ. Athanasius in sermon 4 against the Arians says that Peter first of all acknowledged the divinity of Christ, but then after him all the other disciples. Similar statements on Matt. 16 are made by Chrysostom on Matt. 16, Cyril in book 12, chapter 64 on John, Augustine in sermon 124 on time, and Leo in sermon 2 on the birth of Peter and Paul.

The fifth prerogative is Matt. 16:18, where it is said: *The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* With these words not only is the perpetual stability of the whole Church promised, but also of the rock on which the Church is founded, as Origen says about this text. Therefore, by a special privilege a promise is made to Peter that his chair will never cease to exist; if the other Apostles had a promise like this, the Sees would still be standing of James in Jerusalem, of John in Ephesus, of Matthew in Ethiopia, of Andrew in Scythia; all of them gradually were overcome by the gates of hell. Hence Augustine in the Psalm against the party of the Donatists said: *Number the priests who have sat on the chair of Peter; that is the rock, which the proud gates of hell do not conquer.*

The sixth one is in Matt. 17:27, where the Lord orders tribute to be paid for himself and for Peter: *Give it to them for me and for yourself* From these words Origen, Chrysostom and Jerome write that the Apostles understood that Peter was placed above all the others in Matt. 16; moreover, Chrysostom clearly says in this place that Peter was placed before all the others, and that he was given such great honor that he did not want this to be written about himself by his disciple Mark. For, in his Gospel Mark carefully writes about Peter's denial; but the things that mostly pertain to the glory of Peter, he either omits or mentions very briefly; no other reason can be given for this except that it was what Peter wanted.

Finally, the author of the questions concerning the Old and New Testaments, which are contained in volume 4 of the works of Augustine, at question 75, says that Christ paid two half-shekels, one for himself, and the other for Peter, because as all were contained in Christ, so also all are in Peter: *For he constituted him,* he said, *to be their head so that he would be the shepherd of the Lord's flock.*

But Jerome in chapter 18 on Matthew, after he had said that the Apostles gathered from the paying of the half-shekel that Peter would be the leader of all, adds immediately: The Lord *understanding the cause of the error, wants to cure the desire for glory with the suffering of humility.* Therefore the Apostles erred in thinking Peter would be the head.

I respond that the Apostles did indeed err, but not because they thought Peter would be the leader, but because they were imagining a temporal leadership; for, at the time they thought that nothing else was being promised to them, since they had heard many things about the kingdom of Christ. The Lord often corrected this error, warning that the rulers of the Church were not going to be like the kings of the Gentiles, and that they should prepare themselves for persecutions and death in this world, not for honor and glory.

CHAPTER XX

THREE OTHER PREROGATIVES ARE EXPLAINED FROM THE GOSPEL OF ST. LUKE

The seventh prerogative is taken from Luke 5 and John 21 in which two miracles of Christ are explained in relation to Peter's fishing. Of these the first one clearly designates, as St. Augustine says in tractate 122 on John, the Church militant; the second one refers to the Church triumphant. For, the first one occurred before Christ's resurrection, the second one after the resurrection.

Likewise, in the first case, the nets are not let down only on the right side, or only on the left side, lest we think that only the good or only the bad come to the Church, but it is said indifferently: *Let down your nets for a catch.* But in the second case the nets are let down only on the right side of the boat, because only the good are destined for eternal life.

Moreover, in the first case the nets were breaking, and the boat was almost sinking, which signifies the schisms and heresies and scandals, which cause the Church to be tossed about; but in the second case the net is not broken, as the Evangelist says, as if he were looking back at the first catch of fish in which the nets were broken; and in this case the boat is not tossed about, because in the next life there will be no schisms or scandals.

Please note this: in the first case, the fish are caught without being numbered, so that what is said in Ps. 40:5 might be fulfilled: *Were I to proclaim and tell of them, they would be more than can be numbered.* But in the second case there were none beyond the number, but the certain number 153; because none besides the number of the electare gathered into the kingdom.

Finally, in the first case the fish are brought into the floating boat; in the second they are dragged to the shore, which, because of its stability, designates immortal and blessed life.

Therefore the eminent prerogative of Peter is located in the fact that in both boats and fishing trips, which openly signify the status of the Church, Peter is always found to be the leader. For, in Luke 5:2-3, when the Lord saw two boats, *he got into one of them, which was Simon's,* and he taught from that boat, so that we would understand that the Church is only in that one, and that Christ is teaching there, where Peter is in charge.

Ambrose in sermon 11 said: *The Lord got into this boat only of the Church, in which Peter was constituted captain.* In the same place it is said to Peter alone: *Put out into the deep and let down your nets for a catch.* There Peter as the ship-master and fisherman is commanded to lead the others in fishing. In the same place the Lord, in explaining the metaphor, says to Peter alone: *Do not be afraid, henceforth you will be catching men.* So also in John 21:3 Peter says: *I am going fishing, and they said to him, we will go with you.* And in the same place: *So Simon Peter went aboard and hauled the net ashore.* But what else is signified by these figures or metaphors, but that Peter is the one who leads men from the world to faith and the Church militant, and who, by directing and governing them, leads them to the Church triumphant?

The eighth prerogative is in Luke 22:31-32, where the Lord says: *Simon, Simon,*

behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like 'wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and -when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren. With these words the Lord clearly shows that Peter will be the leader and head of his brothers; that is the way the Greeks and Latins explain it. Theophylact said concerning this text: *Because I designated you the leader of the disciples, after you have wept for denying me, strengthen the others; this is fitting for you, who after me are the rock and foundation of the Church.* Leo in sermon 3 on the anniversary of his becoming Pope said: *There is real supplication for the faith of Peter, so that the future status of others may be more certain, if the mind of the leader is not overcome.*

The ninth is that Christ, after his resurrection, showed himself to Peter first of all the Apostles. This is gathered from the words in Luke 24:34: *The Lord has risen indeed, and has appeared to Simon.* There Ambrose points out that Peter was the first man to whom Christ appeared, for previously he had appeared to Mary Magdalen, as Mark says in his last chapter. This same point is made very clearl by the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 15:3-8: *For I delivered to you,* he said, *as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the Scriptures, and that he appeared to Cephas, then to the twelve. Then he appeared to more than five hundred brethren at one time... Then he appeared to James, then to all the Apostles. Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me.* On this place Chrysostom said: *Therefore, at the beginning he was not seen by all, nor by several together, but by one only and he was the leader and worthy because of his faith.* And after that: *Therefore,* he said, *he appeared first to Peter; for it was fitting that the one who first confessed Christ's divinity should be the first to see him after the resurrection.* Theophylact says something similar in his comments on this place.

CHAPTER XXI

TWO OTHERS ARE EXPLAINED FROM THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN

The tenth is that Peter was the first for whom the Lord washed his feet, as Augustine explains in comments on John 13. And although Chrysostom and Theophylact think concerning this same place that Judas was the first and Peter second, nevertheless even they gather from this place the primacy of Peter. For they say that no one else but Judas would have allowed that his feet should be washed before those of Peter, and that Judas had shamelessly placed himself before the prince of the Apostles. Nevertheless the opinion of Augustine seems to be more probable.

The eleventh is John 21, where Christ predicts to Peter alone his death, death on a cross, so that as he gave him his name, and conferred on him his office, so also in death he would have him as a companion. *When you are old,* the Lord said, yow *will stretch out your hands, and another will gird you and carry you where you do not wish to go. This he said,* the Evangelist adds, *to show by what death he was to glorify God.* Then in the same place the Lord adds, speaking to Peter: *Follow me;* some take these words to mean his pastoral office, like Theophylact, who explains it: *Follow me,* I am sending you out to preach and place the whole world in your hands. Others say it refers to his death, like Euthymius, who explains it in this way: *Follow me,* that is, imitate me by suffering on a cross.

But there will be a complete commentary, if we put both opinions together. For, since the Lord commended his sheep to Peter, and had predicted his type of death, as if concluding everything with one word he says: *Follow me,* that is, be what you are, both in living and in dying. Be the shepherd of souls while you live, and afterwards through death on a cross pass from this world to the Father. And lest we should suspect that these words were said to all, the Lord clearly excludes John, who then physically was following him: *If it is my will that he remain until I come,* he said, *what is that to you? Follow me.*

CHAPTER XXII

ANOTHER NINE PREROGATIVES ARE EXPLAINED FROM THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES AND THE LETTER TO THE GALATIANS

The twelfth prerogative is in Acts 1:15ff., where Peter as the master of the house assembles the disciples, and says that someone should be chosen to take the place of Judas. Concerning this place Chrysostom said: *How is it that they acknowledged that the flock was entrusted to Peter? How is it that he is the leader of this assembly?* And Oecumenius said: *Peter, not James, stands up, as the one to whom the leadership of the disciples had been committed. And no one contradicts what Peter says, but immediately at his direction they put forward two, whom they considered to be worthy, with the prayer that God himself would choose one of them.*

The thirteenth is in Acts 2:14ff., where, after receiving the Holy Spirit, Peter as the first of all proclaims the Gospel, and by that first sermon he converts three thousand men. Concerning this Chrysostom said: *Peter was the mouth of all, but the other eleven stood by him, and so by their witness they gave their approval to what he said.*

The fourteenth is in Acts 3: Iff., where the first miracle in testimony to the Faith was worked by Peter. For although Peter and John were together, only Peter said to the lame man: *I have no silver and gold, but I give you what I have, etc.* Ambrose says beautifully in sermon 69 that Peter rightly performed a miracle by strengthening the man's feet, in order to show that he is the foundation of the whole Church.

The fifteenth is in Acts 5:1 ff., where Peter as the supreme and divine judge recognized and condemned the hypocrisy and fraud of Ananias and Sapphira, and they died upon hearing his words.

The sixteenth is in Acts 9:32, where we read this: *Now as Peter went here and there among them all, etc.* On this verse Chrysostom said: *Like a general walking up and down in his army, he considered which part was taken care of, which part needed his presence; you can see him going about everywhere and being the first one there.*

The seventeenth is in Acts 10: Iff., where Peter as the first of all begins to preach to the Gentiles, just as he was the first to preach to the Jews. And to him alone was the vision given, whereby he was told that it was time to preach to the Gentiles; there also it is beautifully said to him: *Kill and eat.* For it is the function of the head to eat, and by eating to send the food to the stomach, and there unite it with oneself. For, by this metaphor it is signified that it is fitting for Peter that he, as the head of the Church, should convert infidels and make them members of the Church.

But you will object: In Acts 8 does not Philip convert a Gentile, namely, a eunuch who was a minister of Candace the queen of the Ethiopians? And in Acts 9 did not Paul speak to the Gentiles, and dispute with the Greeks? Therefore how can Peter be said to be the first one to preach to the Gentiles?

I respond that the eunuch was a proselyte, that is, he had already converted to Judaism; he was not a plain Gentile, as Cornelius was. For, Peter does not lie in Acts 15:7 when he says he was the first to preach to the Gentiles. Then, in Acts 11:19 Luke writes that

those who had been dispersed, because of the disturbance concerning Stephen, travelled to various regions evangelizing, *Speaking the word to none except Jews.* However, that one of them was Philip, is clear from Acts 8:26ff. Furthermore, if Philip had already preached to a Gentile, and no one reprimanded him: why did Peter later doubt whether it was time to preach to the Gentiles? Why was he stimulated to do this by the heavenly vision? When they heard about this, why were some of the Jews astonished, and why did others accuse Peter that he dared to do such an unusual thing? You can add to this also that the eunuch went to Jerusalem to visit the temple, and he was reading Isaiah in his chariot—these are all clear signs of Judaism.

Finally, Jerome in his letter to Salvina, when speaking about Cornelius, said: *The first one baptized by the Apostle was a sign of the salvation of the Gentiles.* And Chrysostom in homily 22 on Acts, speaking about Cornelius, said: *Do you see whence the beginning is of the Gentiles? It is from a devout man who was considered worthy because of his good works.* But if sometimes the Fathers say that the eunuch, whom Philip baptized, was a Gentile, what they mean is his nation, not his religion.

But concerning Paul, according to the Greek codices, there is no problem. For, in the Greek the words "he was speaking to the Gentiles" are not there, but it only says: *He spoke and disputed against the Hellenists.* But here he calls "Hellenists" the Jews born in Greece and speaking Greek, as Chrysostom and Oecumenius point out. And it is not probable that Paul preached to Gentiles in Jerusalem itself, and no complaint was stirred up by the Hebrews, who afterwards attacked Peter so vehemently, because he had preached to Cornelius.

However, since the Latin codices have, *he spoke to the Gentiles, and disputed against the Hellenists,* it can be said that he was speaking and disputing with the Gentiles, not to bring them to the faith, but to defend the faith against their calumnies. Therefore the same Luke adds not that some were converted, but that they had such hatred for Paul that they tried to kill him; therefore Peter was the first father of both Jews and Gentiles.

The eighteenth is in Acts 12:5, where, *earnest prayer was made to God by the Church,* for Peter who was held in prison; then he was freed by a great miracle. We know that before that time Stephen was in danger, and afterwards also stoned to death; likewise that James was held in the same prison, and later killed. However, we do not read that there was such prayer for them without stop by the Church, as we see now takes place because of Peter's danger. What other reason can be given for this, except that it was not a member, but the head himself who was in danger? Therefore, Chiysostom says with reference to this event: *This prayer is a sign of great love, since all sought their father, etc.*

The nineteenth is in Acts 15:7ff., where Peter is the first to speak in the Council, and James and all the others follow his opinion, as Jerome says in his letter to Augustine, which is #11 among the letters of Augustine; and Theodoretus in a letter to Leo on the same matter, says this: *Paul, the herald of truth, the trumpet of the Holy Spirit, hastened to visit the great Peter, so that to those, who in Antioch were arguing about the established laws, he might bring the answer from him.*

The twentieth is in Gal. 1:18, where Paul says: *After three years I went up again*

to Jerusalem to visit Cephas. On this passage Oecumenius says that Paul went up to Jerusalem to see Peter, as someone greater than himself. Chiysostom in homily 87 on John said: *He was the leader and mouth of the Apostles; therefore Paul went up to see him rather than the others.* Ambrose in comments on Gal. 1 said: *It was right that he wanted to see Peter, because he was the first among the Apostles, to whom the Savior had delegated the care of the Church.* Jerome in letter 89 to Augustine, cited above, said: *The authority of Peter was so great that Paul in his letter wrote: "Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas."*

CHAPTER XXIII

OTHER PREROGATIVES ARE PROPOSED FROM VARIOUS AUTHORS

So far we have reviewed the prerogatives which are taken from the divine writings; now we will add another eight, which we have borrowed from various authors.

Therefore the twenty-first prerogative is that Christ with his own hands baptized only Peter. For, Evodius, Peter's successor as Bishop of Antioch, writes in his letter, which is entitled το Φως, that among women only his Virgin Mother was baptized by Christ; among the men only Peter was baptized by him; Andrew, James and John by Peter, and the others by them. Euthymius reports this in comments on John 3, and Nicephorus in book 2, chapter 3 of his History.

The twenty-second is that only Peter was ordained a bishop by Christ; but the others received their episcopal consecration from Peter. John de Turrecremata proves this in book 2, chapter 32 in his Summa on the Church with many reasons, but there are two principal ones. The first is that the Lord ordained either no bishop, or all, or some, or one.

It cannot be said that he ordained no one. For, if that were the case, we would now have no bishop, for no one can give to another what he himself does not have. Therefore a non-bishop cannot ordain a bishop. If, therefore, the Lord left no one as an ordained bishop, not even Peter, who afterwards ordained Peter and the others?

But it is clear that not all the Apostles were immediately ordained by the Lord. For, at least he did not ordain Paul a bishop, whom he himself called and made an Apostle, but he ordered him to be ordained by the imposition of hands of the ministers of the Church, as is clear from Acts 13:3, and from Leo in his letter to Dioscorus, which is #81 in his works; and in #79 of the records of the Councils, where Leo is speaking about the ordination of bishops, he cites this example of Paul. Then there is Chrysostom, who on this text in Acts says that the ordination of Paul was so true that in it he changed his name; for immediately he says that Saul is now Paul.

Moreover, Anacletus states that James the Less, one of the twelve, was ordained the Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles, and not by Christ immediately; there in letter 2 he writes that a bishop must be ordained by three bishops, as Peter, James the Greater and John ordained James the Less.

Likewise, Clement of Alexandria in book 2, chapter 1 of Eusebius's Histoiy reports that this James was ordained a bishop by Peter, James and John.

Jerome says the same thing in his book on illustrious men, concerning James: *James,* he said, *immediately after the passion of the Lord was ordained Bishop of Jerusalem by the Apostles.*

And it cannot be said that this James was not one of the twelve Apostles; for, Jerome rejects this in his book against Helvidius, and elsewhere we have shown the same thing because it would follow that there is no memory in the Church of one of the twelve Apostles.

But that the Lord did not ordain some is proved from the fact that the Apostles, with the exception of Peter, were equal with each other, and no one had power over another, and all the power communicated to them was given to all commonly, as can be gathered

from the gospels. Therefore, if the Lord ordained one, but not all, and not some, it follows that only Peter was ordained by him.

The second reason is that passim the ancient Fathers teach that the Roman Church is the mother of all the Churches; that from her all the bishops have their consecration and dignity. This does not seem to be true, except in the sense that Peter, who was the bishop of Rome, ordained all the Apostles and all the other bishops, either by himself or through others. For, otherwise since all the Apostles established many bishops in various places, if the Apostles themselves were not made bishops by Peter, certainly most of the bishops would not derive their origin from Peter.

Therefore, what does Anacletus mean when he says in letter 1: *In the New Testament after Christ the order of priests took its beginning from Peter?* For, one cannot speak here about the order of lower priests, that is, the elders; for, it is certain that the Apostles at the Last Supper at the same time were all ordained priests; therefore, he is speaking about the order of major priests, that is, bishops, which is not rightly said to have begun from Peter, if all the Apostles are said to have been ordained immediately by Christ.

Also what does Cyprian mean when he says in book 4 of his letter that the Roman Church is the matrix and root of the whole Catholic Church? And what does Innocent I mean in his letter to the Council of Carthage, which is #91 among the letters of Augustine, when he said: *from him, Peter, the episcopacy and all the authority contained in this name emerged?* Likewise, what does he mean in his letter to the Council of Mileum, which is #93 among the letters of Augustine, when he writes: *As often as the nature of the faith is proclaimed, I think that all the brothers, and our fellow bishops must defer only to Peter, that is, to the authority of his name and honor?* What does it mean when Julius I says in letter 1 to the Orientals: *You could not have incurred this fault, if from whom you received the honor of consecration, you had also taken the law of total observance, and if the See of the Apostle St. Peter, which for us is the mother of priestly dignity, was the teacher of ecclesiastical thinking.*

Finally, what about this, which St. Leo says in sermon 3 on the anniversary of becoming Pope: *If he wanted what he gave to Peter to be shared in common with others, then he never would have given to him alone what he refused to give to others?* And in letter 89: *The Lord wanted this Sacrament to pertain to the office of all the Apostles in such a way that in blessed Peter, the chief of all the Apostles, he established it principally so that from him, as from the head, he would pour his gifts as it were into everyone?*

But, some object with this argument. The episcopacy is included in the apostolate, otherwise what Anacletus writes in letter 2 would not be true, namely, that the bishops succeed the Apostles; but Christ, not Peter, installed all the Apostles. Therefore Christ ordained them bishops, not Peter.

Then there is the fact that to Judas is applied the saying in Ps. 109:8: *His office let another take,* as Peter explains in Acts 1:20. But Peter did not ordain Judas; therefore Peter did not ordain all.

I respond that the episcopacy is contained in the apostolate, and bishops succeed the Apostles, not because if someone is an apostle he is a bishop (for, the Lord in Luke 6:13 chose twelve disciples, and he called them apostles, even before he made them priests,

and much less bishops; for the duty of preaching really belongs to the apostolate, to which was annexed a certain ample and delegated jurisdiction, which can also be in non-bishops); but because all the Apostles were bishops, in fact they were the first bishops of the Church, although they were not ordained by Christ, but by Peter.

Concerning Judas, I respond that in Ps. 109:8 what is called an office [in Latin: *episcopatum},* is not what we now properly call the episcopacy, but a prefecture of some kind. In Hebrew it is imps which means a visitation or prefecture. And it is probable that Peter quoted this Psalm in Hebrew and accommodated the word "prefecture" to the apostolate of Judas.

But Luke reporting this in Greek, followed the translators of the LXX, who translated it as την έπισκοπην; by this word the translators of the LXX could understand prefecture only in a general way, because at their time the episcopacy in the proper sense had not yet been instituted. Additionally, Cicero in book 7 of his letter to Atticus uses this word when he says that he was given the episcopacy of all Campania by Pompey.

It is also possible to respond that the Psalm is speaking about the episcopacy in the proper sense—not in the sense of what Judas had, but what he would have had, if he had not betrayed the Lord.

The twenty-third prerogative is that Peter was the first to uncover the heresiarch, the prince and father of all heresiarchs, who were to come afterwards, namely, Simon the magician, as is evident from Acts 8:20ff., and he condemned him and completely eliminated the heresy.

For, it was very fitting that the prince and father of the Church should overcome the prince and father of heretics; thus, Irenaeus writes in book 1, chapter 20, and at the beginning of book 3, that this Simon was the father of all heretics.

But since Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 15 in his Institutes considers the contention between Peter and Simon as an absurd fable, we will cite the testimonies of ancient Fathers on this matter. For it is mentioned by Hegesippus in book 3, chapter 2 on the destruction of Jerusalem and Clement in book 6, chapters 7,8 and 9 on the Apostolic Constitutions, which explain at length the whole history.

Similarly, Arnobius in book 2 against the Gentiles said: *In Rome herself, finally, the mistress of the world, in which, although men are busied with the practices introduced by king Numa, and the superstitious observances of antiquity, they have nevertheless hastened to gw up their fathers 'mode of life, and attach themselves to Christian truth. For they had seen the chariot of Simon Magus, and his fiery car, blown into pieces by the mouth of Peter, and vanish when Christ was named. They had seen him, Isay, trusting in false gods, and abandoned^ them in their terror, borne down headlong by his own weight, lie prostrate with his legs broken*

The same thing is narrated by Damasus in the life of Peter, Cyril in the Catechesis, Epiphanius in Heresies 21, Theodoretus in book 1 on heretical fables, Ambrose in his Oration on Auxentius, Jerome in his book on illustrious men in the essay on Simon Peter, Sulpicius in book 2 on sacred history, Gregory of Tours in book 1, chapter 25 of his History, Eusebius in book 2, chapter 13 of his History, Maximus in his last sermon on Saints Peter and Paul. Finally, there is Augustine whose words are contained in chapter 1 on his book on the heresies: *In the city of Rome the blessed Apostle Peter got rid of Simon*

Magus by the true power of almighty God.

From the above we understand that the same Augustine in letter 86 to Casulanus when he says: *Indeed this is the opinion of many, although many in Rome claim that it is false, namely, that when the Apostle Peter was going to oppose Simon Magus on Sunday, because of the danger of strong temptation, on the day before fasted together with the Church of the same city, and having obtained such a favorable and glorious success, he maintained the same custom, and some of the Eastern Churches imitated him, etc.,* did not want to say that the opinion about the contention with Simon Magus is uncertain, as Calvin thought, but it deals with the fast on Saturday. For although the cited authors agree in handing on that Peter contended with Simon in Rome, and that he overcame him; still, some say that this was done on a Sunday, and that he had not fasted on the previous day, and that it is not because of this that the Saturday fast was instituted, which is what Augustine is aiguing about in that letter.

The twenty-fourth is that he located his Diocese in Rome especially because of a divine command. For, a clear sign of Peter's primacy seems to be that, since the Apostles were sent by him into the whole world, Peter was sent to the head of the world and the queen of cities.

Leo also teaches this in sermon 1 on the birth of Saints Peter and Paul. *For,* he says, *since the twelve Apostles, having received the gift of all languages from the Holy Spirit, took up the mission of evangelizing the world in the regions of the world assigned to them, the blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, was sent to the citadel of the Roman Empire, so that the law of truth, which was revealed for the salvation of all nations, could be spread by him throughout the whole world from that center.*

And Maximus in sermon 1 on the birth of Saints Peter and Paul said: *Where the world had the center of its empire, there he located the princes of his kingdom.* But there will be more about this in the following question.

The twenty-fifth is that near the end of Peter's life Christ himself appeared to Peter, and when he was asked: *Lord, where are you going?,* he answered: *I am going to Rome to be crucified again.*

Hegesippus in book 3, chapter 2 on the destruction of Jerusalem and Ambrose in his Oration against Auxentius bear witness to this: *At night,* Ambrose said, *he began to go outside the wall, and seeing Christ coming towards him at the gate and about to enter the city, he says, "Lord, where are you going?" Christ responds, "I am coming to Rome to be crucified again." Peter understood that the divine response pertained to his own crucifixion.*

Athanasius also mentions this, although rather obscurely, since in the apology for his own flight, he says about Peter: *When he heard that he had to undergo martyrdom in Rome, he did not reject that perfection, but with joy came to Rome.*

Finally, St. Gregory refers to the same thing in his explanation of the fourth penitential Psalm: *To Peter, he says, I am coming to Rome to be crucified again; for he who in himself had already been crucified said that he would be crucified again in Peter.*

But what does the Lord wish to signify, when he says that he would be crucified again in the crucifixion of Peter, except that Peter is his vicar, and that what happens to Peter, happens to himself? For, previously, something similar had been said to Samuel in 1 Sam. 8:7: *They have not rejected you, but they have rejected me from being king over them.*

CHAPTER XXIV

THREE FINAL PREROGATIVES ARE PRESENTED

The twenty-sixth prerogative is that only those Churches were always considered patriarchal and first, which were founded by Peter. That among the ancients only three Churches were properly patriarchal and first—the Roman, Alexandrian, and Antiochian, is clear from canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea and from session 16 of Chalcedon, according to letter 3 of Anacletus; also from letter 53 of Leo to Anatolius, and from the letter of Gregoiy to Eulogius, which is 37 in book 6, and Luther and Calvin do not deny this.

Then at Jerusalem for about fifty years there was a fourth patriarchy, but in name only, not really, that is, with honor but not with power. For, the patriarch of Alexandria not only sat in the second place in the Councils, but he really preceded all the archbishops and bishops of Egypt and Libya. And the Antiochian not only sat in the third place, but he also preceded all the archbishops and bishops of the East. The patriarch of Jerusalem sal in the fourth place, but he preceded no archbishop or bishop; in fact he was subject to the archbishop of Caesarea, who was the metropolitan of Palestine, and also to the patriarch of Antioch who, as we said, presided over the whole East. That this was the situation is clear from canon 7 of the Council of Nicaea, where it is determined that the bishop of Jerusalem should have honor after Rome, Alexandria and Antioch, but that did in no way detract from the authority of the metropolitan, who was in Caesarea.

Accordingly St. Jerome in a letter to Pammachus against John, the bishop of Jerusalem, addresses the same John as follows: *You who are searching for ecclesiastical rules and use the canons of the Nicene Council, answer me: what is the connection of Palestine to the Alexandrian bishop? Unless I am mistaken, there it is determined that Caesarea is the metropolitan of Palestine, and Antioch of the whole East. Therefore either you should have referred the matter to the archbishop of Caesarea, with whom, since you had broken communion with him, you knew that we are in communion, or if judgment was to be sought from afar, the letter should have been directed to Antioch. Bia I know why you did not want to send it to Antioch. You preferred to cause trouble rather than render due honor to your metropolitan.*

Hence also Leo in letter 62 to Maximus of Antioch said: *Bishop Juvenal, in order to gain control over the province of Palestine, believed that he could take care of it, and he dared to confirm it through false documents.* Finally, neither Anacletus, nor Leo, nor Gregory, cited above where they name the patriarchal Sees, ever make any mention of Jerusalem.

Afterwards the patriarchate of Constantinople was added to the above. For, at the time of the Council of Nicaea, the city of Constantinople did not exist, and much less the patriarchate of Constantinople. For, in the 25th year of the reign of Constantine, that is, five years after the Council of Nicaea, Constantinople was dedicated, as St. Jerome writes in his Chronicle. But afterwards at the first Council of Constantinople, and then at Chalcedon, the bishop of Constantinople attempted not only to become a patriarchate, but also to obtain the second place among the patriarchs. But he did not seek that from

the Roman Pontiffs before the time of Justinian. However, during the time of Justinian, that is, after the year of the Lord 500, both with the help of the Emperor and with the permission of the Roman Pontiffs, the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem began to be numbered among the patriarchs with no further opposition.

That being the case, Calvin wonders in book 4, chapter 6 § 13 of his Institutes, not unreasonably, why there were so few patriarchal Sees and why they were arranged in that order. For, if you look at antiquity, the Jerusalem See should have occupied the first place, but it is in the fourth place, or rather in no place at all. If you consider the dignity of the first bishop, certainly after the Roman See should come the See of Ephesus, which Paul founded, and John ruled until his death. Jerusalem also, whose first bishop was the Apostle James, a cousin of the Lord, should have preceded Alexandria, whose bishop was Mark, a disciple of the Apostles. Moreover, why did Alexandria precede Antioch, since Antioch was older than Alexandria, and in Antioch Peter himself had lived, while in Alexandria there were the disciples of Peter?

But if you say, as Calvin theorizes in book 4, chapter 7 § 14 in his Institutes, that in establishing the Sees of the patriarchs the Council of Nicaea had in mind only the nature of the most noble and royal cities, St. Leo will contradict that in his letter to 54 to Martian Augustus, when he responds to the argument of the Greeks, who were saying that the See of Constantinople ought to be located after the Roman patriarch, because it was also the imperial city. Thus he says: *Let the city of Constantinople have its own glory, and by the protecting right hand of God, may it enjoy the lasting rule of your mercy, but the nature of earthly matters is one thing, while that of divine things is something else. And outside of that rock, which the Lord placed as the foundation, there will be no stable building.* And Gelasius in a letter to bishop Dardanus said: *For in what is said about the royal city, the power of the earthly kingdom is one thing, but the distribution of ecclesiastical dignities is something else. For, just as any small city does not diminish the prerogative of the king's presence, so the imperial presence does not change the nature of the religious dispensation.*

Next we will ask: why were only three patriarchal Sees established, since there are many more great and royal cities? At that time the throne of the Emperor was always in large, royal cities. But at the time of the Council of Nicaea, the imperial throne in the East was at Nicomedia, which is a very famous city of Bithynia. In the West, there were Treves and Milan, both considered famous cities; Treves was in transalpine Gaul, and Milan in cisalpine Italy. Moreover, at that time Diocletian was living at Nicomedia, from where he ruled the whole East; Maximianus from Milan governed Italy, Africa and Illyrica; Constantius, the father of Constantine, from Treves ruled Gaul and Britain.

Hence Gelasius in a letter to bishop Dardanus said: *We laughed at the fact that they want the prerogative to be given to Acacius, because he was the bishop of a royal city. Did the Emperor not stay many times in Milan, Ravenna, Sirmium and Treves? Did the priests of these cities usurp for themselves dignities beyond what was due to them?*

Therefore, why did Nicomedia, Treves and Milan not become patriarchal Sees?

In addition, the Council of Nicaea did not institute the patriarchal Sees, as Calvin falsely claims, but merely confirmed them. For, the words of the Council of Nicaea say

this in canon 6: *The ancient custom continues in Egypt, or Pentapolis, so that the bishop of Alexandria has authority over all of them.* And after that: *Similarly also at Antioch, and the other provinces, the honor of each Church is to be preserved.* And later in canon 7: *Since an ancient custom maintained, and it is an old tradition, that is, that honor is to be given to the bishop of Jerusalem, let him therefore have that honor.*

Therefore the true and only reason for that number of patriarchal Sees is the dignity of Peter. For, only those Churches were considered patriarchal in the proper sense in which Peter presided as bishop. But Peter personally presided at Antioch and Rome; but in Alexandria he presided either by himself, as Nicephorus says in book 4, chapter 3, or through he disciple Mark, whom he sent there, in order that he should found the Church in his name, as St. Gregory teaches in book 6, letter 37, to Eulogius in Alexandria, where he says: *There are many apostles, but for dominion only the chair of the prince of the Apostles has the fidl authority, which, being one, is in three places. For he himself exalted the chair, in which he was worthy to sit and to finish his present life. He gave honor to the chair, to which he sent the Evangelist, his disciple; he strengthened the chair upon which he sat for seven years, although he was going to leave it. Therefore, since there is one chair belonging to one, upon which now by divine authority three bishops sit, whatever good I hear about you, I impute this to myself.* And in the same place he says: *He spoke to me about the chair of Peter, who is seated on the chair of Peter, etc.*

There he says that the bishop of Alexandria is sitting on the chair of Peter, because, in the name of Peter, Mark ruled as the first bishop of Alexandria. Pope Gelasius teaches exactly the same thing in a decree published at the Council of 70 bishops.

Leo presents the same reason in letter 53 to Anatolius: *There is no lack of dignity in his chair at Alexandria, which he gained through the Evangelist St. Mark, a disciple of St. Peter. Also the Church of Antioch, in which the name of "Christian" was used for the first time because of the preaching of the Apostle Peter, perseveres in the order of the paternal constitution, and having been placed in the third rank, it will never fall below that.* Likewise Anacletus in letter 3 said: *The second chair was consecrated in Alexandria, in the name of St. Peter, by Mark his disciple. But the third chair at Antioch is held to be honorable because it was established in the name of the same blessed Apostle Peter.*

Therefore, this is the reason for the number of these Sees or Dioceses. The reason for the order is because all three are chairs of Peter, but he administered the Roman See by himself until his death; Alexandria through the Evangelist Mark, and Antioch through Evodius.

Therefore, just as the Apostle Peter is greater than the Evangelist Mark, and Mark the Evangelist than Evodius, who was neither an apostle nor an evangelist, so also the Roman Church in dignity and authority surpasses Alexandria, and Alexandria surpasses Antioch. And although it is not to be denied that Peter in choosing took into consideration the importance of the cities, as St. Leo says in letter 84 to Anastasius, nevertheless (as has been said) the real and immediate reason for the honor and power of these Churches was the primacy and dignity of Peter.

The twenty-seventh is the feast of the chair of Peter. For, that a feast day is celebrated

publicly in the Church in honor of the institution of the episcopacy of Peter, and nothing like this is done for the Sees of the other Apostles, is an argument that the See of Peter in a singular way excels all the others; in fact it indicates that it is the only and singular chair from which the whole world must be taught, as Optatus says in book 2 against Parmenias. That the feast of the Chair of St. Peter is very ancient can be known easily, both from the martyrology of Bede and from the sermon that Augustine preached to the people, which is sermon 15 on the Saints.

The twenty-eighth prerogative is this: in formal documents the ancients, after the name of the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit, added the name of the prince of the Apostles. Bishop Atticus writes that at the end of the Council of Chalcedon it is read in this way: *Lest in writing canonical letters, which the Latin custom calls "formed," some error or mistake might by chance be presumed, this was usefully proposed and adopted by the 318 assembled Fathers, that the official letters should have this type of calculation or computation, that is, that the first Greek letters of Father, and Son and Holy Spirit should be taken as the computation of a number, namely,* π, υ, α, *which letters signify the number eighty, four hundred and first. Also the first letter of the Apostle Peter, that is,* π, *signifies the number 80.*

The first letter is that of the one who wrote the epistle; to whom it is written, the second letter; the one who receives it, the third letter; the city also, from which it is written, is the fourth letter. The time of the writing, whatever it is, is assumed to be the same as the number. And so with all these Greek letters which, as we said, express numbers, having been joined together into one, the epistle is known to be authentic, wherever it is received. These are his words.

Optatus of Mileum mentions formal letters in book 2 against Parmenias with these words: *With this correspondence of formal letters he (Siricius) communicates to us in one society of communion.* And the Council of Mileum, in canon 20, forbids clerics to take part in the common singing without the use of formal letters. On this see Burchardus in book 2, chapter 227, Ivo in book 6, chapters 433 and 434, and Sidonius Apollinaris in book 7, letter 2.

CHAPTER XXV

THE PRIMACY OF PETER IS CONFIRMED BY THE TESTIMONIES OF THE GREEK AND LATIN FATHERS

What remains is to quote the testimonies of the ancient Fathers in favor of the primacy of Peter. But it is necessary here to observe that if the Fathers said that Peter was the head of the Church, or had primacy over the Apostles and the Church, it should be enough to show from the opinion of the Fathers what we want to prove. For, the adversaries say that by these two words, *head and primacy,* supreme power in the Church is signified. Therefore, the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 7, col. 527, say that it is a real sign of the Antichrist to have primacy in the Church. And Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 3 of his Institutes said: *As long as the true and pure face of the Church lasted, all those words of pride, with which afterwards the Roman Church began to exalt herself, were completely unheard of* He is speaking about the words "head" and "primacy"; and in the same place he says that at the time of Jerome the true face of the Church still existed.

First of all, therefore, he cites from the Greeks Origen (I am omitting Dionysius, Clement of Rome, Anacletus and similar authors, because they are not recognized by the adversaries) who on Rom. 6 said this: *Since the care of feeding the sheep was committed to Peter, and the Church was founded on him as on the earth itself, the confession of no other virtue was required of him except that of charity.* Eusebius in the Chronicle of the year 44 after the birth of Christ said: *Peter was an apostle from Galilee, and the first pontiff of Christians.*

Here the difference should be noted that Eusebius places between Peter and the bishops of other cities. For, concerning Peter he does not say "the first bishop of Rome," as he does say in the same place about James: *James the brother of the Lord was ordained by the Apostles as the first bishop of the Church of Jerusalem.* And about Evodius: *Evodius was ordained as the first bishop of Antioch.* He does not speak in this way about Peter, but he says "he was the first pontiff of the Christians," so that we might understand that James was the pontiff of one city, but Peter of the whole Christian world. The same author in book 2, chapter 14 of his Histoiy calls Peter the most approved and greatest of all the Apostles, the prince and leader of all, and the teacher of God's army. But what else is it to be the leader of God's army but to be the head of the Church militant?

St. Basil in a sermon on the judgment of God, when speaking about Peter, said: *Thai blessed man who presided over the other disciples, to whom the keys of the heavenly kingdom were given, etc.* St. Gregory Nazianzen in his Oration on Moderation, wishing to show that in all things there must be some order, takes his argument from the Apostles who, although all were great, nevertheless had one leader: *You see,* he said, *how among Christi disciples, although all were great and renowned and worthy of their call, this one is called the Rock, and he has the foundation of the Church attributed to his faith, and the rest of the disciples peacefully accept that they are under him.*

St. Epiphanius in Heresies 51 said: *He chose Peter and made him leader of the disciples.* And in Ancoratus: *He is the one,* he said, *who heard the words, "Feed my sheep, " to whom*

the flock was entrusted.

Cyril of Jerusalem in his Catechetics 2 calls Peter the most excellent prince of the Apostles. Cyril of Alexandria in book 12, chapter 64 on John said: *As the leader and head of the others he was the first to exclaim: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God.* And in the Thesaurus he said (if we follow St. Thomas in his work against the Greeks): *As Christ received from the Father authority over the Church of the nations, the leader going out from Israel, over all preeminence and power, over everything that is, so that all should bow before him; so also Christ committed fully to Peter and his successors, and to no one else, everything that belonged to him.*

St. John Chrysostom in homily 55 on Matthew said: *He established Peter the pastor of the futiire Church.* And after that: *God alone can grant that the future Church, assaulted by the force of great waves, remains immobile, whose pastor and head* (note the word "head" which to Calvin is unheard of) *is a fisherman and a man of low birth.* And after that: *Christ made Jeremiah the father of one people, but this man the father of the whole world.* And in his last homily on John he repeats several times that the care of his brothers was entrusted to Peter, that is, of the Apostles, and the care of the whole world was also given to him.

Euthymius on John 21 says twice that Peter received the presidency over the disciples. And in the same place he said: *If you say, in what manner did James receive the See of Jerusalem? I respond that this Peter was constituted the teacher of the whole world.* There Euthymius teaches—as James was the bishop of Jerusalem, so Peter was the bishop of the whole world.

Theophylact in comments on Luke 22:32 where the Lord says to Peter, "Strengthen your brethren": *The understanding of this,* he said, *is easy. Because I made you prince of the disciples; after having denied me and wept over it, and having repented, confirm the others, because this is fitting for you who, after me, are the rock and foundation of the Church.* And after that: *Peter, when you have had a change of heart, you will be a good example of repentance for all; since you were an apostle and denied me, you will again receive the primacy of all and the overseeing of the world.*

Hugo Etherianus or Herettianus about the year 1160, at the time of the Emperor Emmanuel, wrote some books against the Greeks on the procession of the Holy Spirit; in this work in book 3, chapter 17 he said this: *From the evidence of the matter it is clearly apparent that Christ constituted Peter and his successor the prince and head perpetually not only of the Latins and Greeks, of the whole west and north, but also of the Armenians, Arabs, Jews, of those in the east and south.*

We address this to the Greeks, not because it was the Greek nation, but because he wrote it in Greek, for the most part, and he did it in the palace of the Greek Emperor.

From the Latins St. Cyprian in his letter to Quintus says that Peter did not want to say, when he was rebuked by Paul, that he had the primacy, and that he should be obeyed; with these words he indicates that Peter had the primacy and could command all the others. And lest perhaps the adversaries should say that Peter, in the opinion of Cyprian, did not say that he had the primacy because he had denied Christ, let us listen to Augustine explaining this place in Cyprian in book 2, chapter 1 on Baptism: *The same Cyprian,* he said, *in his letter to Quintus says this: Peter, whom the Lord chose as the first, and upon whom he built*

his Church, when Paul disagreed with him about circumcision, afterwards did not claim something for himself insolently, or act arrogantly, by saying that he had the primacy, and that he should be obeyed by the young and the new converts, etc. And right after that: *Behold,* he said, *how Cyprian mentions, what we also learned from the Holy Scriptures, the Apostle Peter, in whom the primacy of the Apostles surpasses all in such an excellent way, etc.*

The same St. Cyprian, in his book on the unity of the Church, or on the simplicity of prelates (as we deduced above), makes Peter the head, fount, root of the whole Church. And about him he says in his letter to Jubajanus: *We have the head and root of one Church.* Therefore, Cyprian freely uses those two words, which Calvin says were "unheard of in the ancient Church. St. Maximus in sermon 3 on the Apostles: *Therefore, Peter had such great merit with the Lord, that after rowing his small boat he handed over to him the governance of the whole Church.*

Optatus in book 2 against Parmenias: *There is one chair,* he said, *and you dare not deny that you know that the chair in the city of Rome was conferred first on Peter, and because of that he is Cephas, the one in whom the unity of the chair is observed by all; and the other apostles do not defend their own chairs in a singular way, that one should become a schismatic or sinner by establishing another chair against that unique one. Therefore then is one chair, which is first in special gifts. Peter was the first to occupy it; Linus succeeded him and Cletus Linus, etc.* Here you see the idea of the head and the chair of Peter and his successors, and that the unique chair of the whole world is named; these things to Calvin were unheard of.

St. Ambrose in comments on Luke 24 calls Peter the Vicar of the love of Christ towards us, and he says he is the leader of all. And on 2 Cor. 12 he said: *Andrew did not receive the primacy, but Peter.* Here is another word that Calvin never heard of. The same author says regarding Gal. 1 that the care of the Churches was entrusted by the Lord to Peter. Finally, in sermon 11 he said: *The Lord entered only into this boat of the Church in which Peter is established as the teacher, and the Lord said: Upon this rock I will build my Church. This boat sails into the depths of this world in such a way that, as the world passes away, it keeps unharmed all whom it receives; we see a sign of this already in the Old Testament. For just as the ark of Noah, while the world was undergoing shipwreck, kept safe all those who went aboard, so also the Church of Peter, while the world is being consumed, keeps safe all those whom she has embraced; and as then, when the flood was over, a dove brought a sign of peace to Noah's ark, so also when the judgment has taken place, Christ will bring the joy of peace to the Church of Peter.*

St. Jerome in book 1 against Jovinianus said: *Among the twelve one is chosen, and having been established as the head, the occasion of schism is removed. But why was not the virginal John chosen? He was passed over on account of his age, because Peter was older, lest an adolescent who was almost a boy should be preferred to men of mature age* Here again you hear the word "head," which to Calvin was unheard of.

St. Augustine says passim that Peter had the primacy, but especially in book 2, chapter 1 on Baptism, which we have already cited; in this context he adds: *I suppose that therein no slight to Cyprian in comparing him with Peter in respect to his crown of martyrdom:*

rather I ought to be afraid lest I am showing disrespect towards Peter. For who can be ignorant that the primacy of his apostleship is to be preferred to any episcopate whatever? But, granting the difference in the dignity of their Sees, yet they have the same glory in their martyrdom.

It should be observed in this place that, in the opinion of Augustine, the See of Peter absolutely surpasses the Sees of particular bishops, since it is the truth and he is not slighting Peter in any way, if he compares Cyprian with him; but Cyprian was not only a bishop, but also the primate of all Africa.

It should also be noted that Augustine thought that the martyrdom of Cyprian could be compared with the martyrdom of Peter, although that of Peter was much more noble, because the palms of all martyrs are in the same genus. But he thought that the See of Cyprian could not be compared with the See of Peter, because the See of Peter alone is more noble than that of Cyprian, but it is in a certain sense in the same genus, for they differ like the whole and a part. For, Peter was not only the bishop of Rome, as Cyprian was of Carthage, but Peter was also the pontiff of the whole world, while Cyprian was the pontiff of one part only.

The same Augustine, when speaking about Peter's repentance in sermon 124 on time, said: *He cures the disease of the whole body in the head itself of the Church, and in the crown of the head he obtains the health of all the members, etc.* The author of the questions concerning the Old and New Testaments, which are contained in volume 4, question 75, of the works of Augustine, said this: *Just as all the causes of the magisterium were in the Savior, so after the Savior they are all contained in Peter. For, he constituted him their head, so that he would be the pastor of the Lord's flock.* And after that: *It is manifest,* he said, *that all are contained in Peter; for, when praying for Peter, he is recognized as having prayed for all. For, always in their leader the people are either corrupted or praised.*

St. Leo teaches this passim in sermon 3 on becoming the Supreme Pontiff: *Peter is chosen,* he said^ow *the whole world, and he is placed before the call of all the nations, all the Apostles and all the Fathers of the Church, so that although in the people of God there are many priests, and many pastors, still Peter really rules over all those whom Christ rules principally.* And in letter 84 to Anastasius, near the end, he said: *By a sweet disposition it has been provided so that all do not claim everything for themselves, but that there should be individuals in the single provinces; thus among these brothers there is one opinion. Also, certain ones established in the larger cities assume a more ample burden, through whom the care of the universal Church flows to the one chair of Peter, and no one ever dissents from their head.* Please note that here you have the word "head" and the care of the universal Church.

St. Prosper in the book on ingratitude:

Rome is the See of Peter, who was made the chief
Pastor for the world; what he does not have in arms,
He has in religion, etc.

Arator says on Acts 1 the following about Peter:

—to him the Lamb handed over
The sheep he saved by suffering, and he made him
Pastor of the flock throughout the world, a task
The leader embraced, etc.

St. Gregory in book 4, letter 32 to Mauritius said: *To all familiar with the Gospel it is clear that the care of the whole Church was given by the Lord to blessed Peter, the chief of all the Apostles.* And after that he said: *Behold, he received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of binding and loosing was given to him, the care and preeminence of the whole Church were given to him.*

Bede in his homily on the vigil of St. Andrew, concerning the words, *Jesus looked at him, etc.* (John 1:42), said: *He saw the simplicity of his heart, he saw the loftiness of his mind, for which rightly he was put in charge of the whole Church.*

And in a homily for the feast of Saints Peter and Paul he said: *Therefore blessed Peter, who with true faith confessed Christ, and followed him in love, received in a special the keys of the kingdom of heaven and the fullness of judicial power, so that all believers in the world may understand that those, who in any way separate themselves from the unity of the faith or his society, cannot be absolved from the bonds of their sins, nor enter the gates of the kingdom of heaven.*

St. Bernard in letter 237 to Eugene wrote: *The place on which you stand is holy ground; it is the place of Peter, the place of the prince of the Apostles, where his feet stood; it is the place of the one whom the Lord constituted as the master of his house, and the overseer of all his possessions.* And in book 2 on Consideration he says about Peter: *Like the Led walking upon water, he designated him the unique Vicar of Christ, who should preside over not one people, but all peoples, since much water signifies many peoples.*

With these 24 testimonies of the Fathers, like the voices of the 24 elders in the Apocalypse, the consensus of the early Church is shown clearly, both Greek and Latin, to which absolutely nothing can be responded, except what Luther and Calvin say about Leo; but they spoke in a human way and were deceived.

But if that is the case, then why does no one ever reprimand them? Certainly Epiphanius, Theodoretus, Augustine, Damascene drew a list of heresies and heretics, and in it they also included Origen. But why, I ask, did they not include among the errors of Origen that he said that the supreme power of feeding the sheep was given by Christ to Peter? Why did they not include Cyprian, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Optatus, Leo and others among the heretics, since they taught so clearly that Peter had the primacy and was the head of the Church, and that the whole world was committed to him? Certainly it was necessary that such a great error, which so plainly favors the Antichrist, as they say, should have been written down by the pens of all the authors.

Therefore with one voice the Ancients proclaim that the ecclesiastical primacy was given by Christ to Peter. Since so many outstanding prerogatives of Peter bear witness to it, since in the holy and divine writings we see that this primacy was both lovingly promised and faithfully conferred on him, we will really be seen to be too obstinate, if we close our eyes against such a clear light of truth.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE ARGUMENT FROM THE COMPARISON OF PETER WITH JAMES IS REFUTED

The arguments which usually are made against the primacy of Peter for the most part are refuted by the explanation of the two places in Scripture, Matt. 16 and John 21, where we discussed the rock, the keys and the sheep. But there are three more: one is from the comparison of Peter with James; the second is from the relation of Peter with Paul; the third is from the horrible and foul faults of Peter, which by the will of God the Holy Spirit wanted to be committed to writing, so that we do not attribute too much to the Apostle Peter.

Now the first argument is that of Luther in his book on the power of the pope, where he proves with the following reasons that James was greater than Peter.

First. Christ was the bishop of Jerusalem, not Rome, and his apostles were the priests; therefore James, who after Christ's passion became the bishop of Jerusalem, succeeded Christ, or certainly was his vicar, not Peter.

Secondly. Jerusalem is the mother of all the Churches, for *out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem* (Isa. 2:3); therefore James is the father of all the Churches, not Peter. Furthermore, the Council of Nicaea in canon 7 attributes the primacy to the bishop of Jerusalem; and that is confirmed by ancient custom and tradition.

We can add two important testimonies. One is from Clemenζ who in book 6 of the Disposition found in book 2, chapter 1 of Eusebius's History, says this: *Peter, James and John after the ascension of the Savior, although by him they became prelates for all, still they did not claim form themselves the glory of the primacy, but they established James, who was called the Just One, bishop of the apostles.*

Luther has this in mind in his book on the power of the pope, when he says that Peter, James and John rejected their own primacy, and they conferred their own on James the Less.

Another is that of Chrysostom who, in homily 3 on Acts, said: *Consider the modesty of James. He had accepted the office of being bishop of Jerusalem, and still he says nothing. But keep in mind also the singular modesty of the other disciples—how they confer on him the chair of authority, and no longer contend by arguing among themselves.*

I will respond to the first argument. Christ was not the bishop of any particular city, but was and is the pontiff, not of the See of Jerusalem, but of the whole Church, and no one succeeds him, because he lives forever. Next, I say that it was more fitting that his vicar should be established somewhere else, rather than in Jerusalem. Since, just as the law and the priesthood were changed by the coming of Christ, so also it was fitting that the place of the high priest should be changed, and that all things truly become new. Therefore perhaps that is the reason why the temple and Jerusalem were burned and destroyed soon after the Ascension of the Lord.

To the second reason I say that the Church of Jerusalem is the mother of all Churches in antiquity, and distinguished for its many privileges, because of the presence of the Lord and the Apostles, which it had for a long time, and especially because of the mysteries of our redemption which were worked and perfected in that place; however, this is not an argument against the primacy of Peter. For, just as James was the pastor and bishop

of the Church in Jerusalem, so Peter was the pastor and bishop of the whole Church; and therefore also of Jerusalem, which is a part of the whole Church.

Thus Chrysostom and Euthymius refute this argument in commentaries on John 21; Bernard agrees with them in book 2 of his Book of Consideration, where he says: *James was content with Jerusalem and conceded the whole world to Peter.*

I now respond to the third reason: Luther did not read carefully the Council of Nicaea; for, as we proved above, at Nicaea the fourth place among the patriarchs is given to the bishop of Jerusalem, with regard to a certain honorary seating; but he was not given any true jurisdiction. For, as a simple bishop he is subject to the bishop of Caesarea, the metropolitan for all of Palestine.

Next I respond to the testimony of Eusebius: That text of Eusebius is without doubt corrupt. For although in the Basilian codex of the version of Ruffinus those words are present, which we have cited above, nevertheless in the Cologne codex, a translation made by a Catholic, the word "primacy" does not appear, and for the words "bishop of the apostles," he renders it "the bishop of Jerusalem."

This reading agrees first of all with Nicephorus, who cites the text like this in book 2, chapter 3, and it also agrees with the opinion of the same Eusebius, who in the same book 2, chapter 14 of his History says that Peter was the greatest of the Apostles, and first of the first

Then it also agrees with the Greek codex, with both the Vatican codex and also the Parisian, which was published recently. For, it reads like this in both codices: Πέτρον γάρ φήσι και Ιάκωβον και Ιωάννην μετά την άνάλυψιν του Σωτηρος ώς άν και ύπο τον Κυρίου προτετιμημένους μη έπιδικά ζεσθαι δοξης άλλα Ιάκωβον τον δίκαιον έπίσκοπον Ιεροσολύμων έλέσθαι.

Therefore Clement of Alexandria as quoted in Eusebius does not say that Peter, James and John gave the primacy of the whole Church to James the Less, and established him as the bishop of the Apostles, which is absurd; but he only says that those prominent Apostles did not seek their own gloiy and therefore did not obtain for themselves the most noble episcopacy of all at that time, but conferred it on James the Less. Even if the episcopacy of one city takes nothing away from the primacy, nevertheless it was no small glory to become the bishop of Jerusalem in a time when there was none more noble among the particular episcopacies.

To the quote from Chiysostom I say that Chrysostom is speaking about the chair of a particular episcopacy, since he says: *the Apostles conferred the chair on James.* For, it is clear from many texts that Chiysostom absolutely placed Peter before James. Thus, in his homily on John 21 regarding the words "Follow me" he said: *With these words again he shows to concern and friendly affection for him. But if someone should ask how did James acquire tin See of Jerusalem? I would respond that Peter, the teacher of the whole world, appointed him.*

The same Chiysostom in homily 3 on Acts, after the words quoted as an objection to us. adds the following comments about Peter: *Deservedly the first one of all uses his authority in the council, so that he has everything under control. For Christ said to him: When you turned again, strengthen your brethren* (Luke 22:32).

CHAPTER XXVII

ON THE COMPARISON OF PETER WITH PAUL

Another argument is taken from the fact that Paul by antonomasia is called the Apostle; for because of that it seems to follow that he, rather than Peter, is the prince of the Apostles. Additionally there is the fact that in ancient figures cut upon a signet-ring, by which the documents of the Sovereign Pontiffs were signed, the images of Peter and Paul are found, but of Paul on the right and Peter on the left. St. Thomas mentioned this in his lecture 1 on Galatians, and Peter Damianus in his treatise on the same matter.

I respond that Paul was called the Apostle by antonomasia, not because he was greater than Peter in power or authority, but for two other reasons, which take nothing away from the primacy of Peter. One was, because he wrote more, and he was more learned and wise than the others; for then we almost call him the Apostle through antonomasia, when we cite his writings. The other reason was, because to an apostle precisely as an apostle it pertains to plant the faith. But Paul planted the faith in more places than anyone else. While the other apostles were sent to certain provinces, Paul was sent to all the Gentiles, without the determination of a certain province. And he even says of himself: *I worked harder than any of them* (1 Cor. 15:10).

Jerome also declares in his comments on Amos 5:8 concerning these words: *Who calls for the waters of the sea, and pours them out upon the surface of the earth,* that Paul not only planted the faith of Christ throughout the whole large area, which stretches from Jerusalem to Illyricum, as Paul himself says in Rom. 15:19, but also from the Red Sea to the ocean around almost the whole world, so that the land came to an end before his zeal for preaching did. Therefore, in what is proper to an apostle, Paul excelled, and as Peter is called the prince of the Apostles, because he was appointed the head and shepherd of the sheep, so also Paul can be called the prince of the Apostles, because he fulfilled the apostolic office excellently. It is similar to the way in which Virgil is called the prince of poets, and Cicero the prince of orators.

St. Augustine included both reasons with few words in book 3, chapter 3 to Boniface: *When the word "Apostle" is said, if which Apostle is meant is not expressed, then it is understood to be only Paul, because he is more known on account of his many letters, and he worked harder than all the others.*

The objection raised about the images of Peter and Paul, which usually are so arranged that Paul is seen to be to the right of Peter, can be answered in many ways. For, first of all, although it is well established that Peter was greater than Paul in authority, as we showed above by the testimony of Cyprian in the letter to Quintus, of Augustine in letter 19 to Jerome, of Jerome in letter 89 to Augustine, of Gregory in homily 18 on Ezekiel, of Theodoretus in his letter to Leo, and of Oecumenius on Gal. 1, still although it is established that Paul should be placed before Peter for several reasons, that would not be a hindrance to the Roman Pontiffs or to the supreme pontificate of Peter. It would not hinder the Roman Pontiffs, since they acknowledge both Peter and Paul as predecessor and father. Indeed both Apostles founded the Roman Church, and governed it, so that

besides others Irenaeus says in book 3, chapter 3 that both finished their life in the city of Rome by martyrdom. Therefore, all the glory of Paul belongs to the Roman Pontiffs. Also the great dignity and authority of Paul is no hindrance to the pontificate of Peter; although it was extraordinary, it was on a different level.

Wherefore, just as among the Jewish people Moses was greater than Aaron, and nevertheless Aaron was really and truly the high priest, and the posterity of Aaron, not of Moses, succeeded in that great dignity of their father, since the power of Moses was extraordinary and that of Aaron was ordinary, so also if we were to admit that, because of an extraordinary privilege, Paul was greater than Peter, we would not because of that deny that Peter was the ordinary and supreme pontiff of the Church.

Then it can also be responded that it did not always happen that in the ancient images Paul occupied the right side. Since in those that are now extant in Rome, as in some of them Paul is seen to be on the right, so in not a few others he is seen to be on the left; and as Paul is on the right in official documents, so in coins he is placed on the left.

And perhaps the Ancients did this deliberately, so that of the two great Apostles they gave precedence now to one, now to the other, so that in this way they might signify that these two Apostles are either equal among themselves, or that they did not know which one should precede the other. For, although Peter was greater in power, Paul was greater in wisdom, as St. Maximus says excellently in his last sermon on Peter and Paul, where he says that the key of authority was given to Peter and the key of wisdom to Paul.

Hence St. Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles said: *By the grace of God he raised these to the summit among all the members of the Church in such wise that he constituted them in the body, whose head is Christ, the quasi twin lights of the eyes. Concerning their merits and virtues there is no difference, and we should not think there is any difference, because they were in election equal, in labor similar, and in end the same.*

And St. Maximus said in the cited place: *Therefore the blessed Peter and Paul stand out among all, and they excel in a special prerogative. But among themselves which one deserves the first place is uncertain. For I think they are equal in merits, because they are equal in their suffering.*

And St. Gregory in book 1, last chapter of his Dialogue said: *The Apostle Paul is the brother of Peter, who is the first of the Apostles in apostolic preeminence.*

A third response can also be given. For, as Anthony Nebrissensis pointed out in the Annotations to 50 places in Scripture, when two men are placed together, formerly it was observed that the senior and more honorable man was placed to the left, but the younger man occupied the right side, and something would precede as a sign of deference; hence they were said to be guards or servants who protected the right side of famous men for the sake of defense. He proves this with many arguments, but especially with the testimony of two illustrious poets. For Ovid in book 5 of Festivals says:

And he went in the midst of the youth,
Without their being offended,
And on the right, if there was a companion.

In addition, we learn from Virgil that he is said to be in the interior, who is on the left side; for he says in book 5 of the Aeneid about Cloanthus, who sailed on the right side of Gyas :

He squeezed a path between Gyas's ship and the booming rocks
Inside to starboard, suddenly passing the leader.

We can add the testimony of Eusebius, who in book 1 of his life of Constantine writes that he saw Constantine as a youth in Palestine travelling with the older Augustus and walking always to his right; and there cannot be any doubt but that the young Constantine, and as a private person, was in the place less honorable than that of the older Augustus.

There is no opposition to this in the fact that Ambrose in a sermon 61 on Pentecost and Jerome, in his Commentary on Eph. 1, say that to sit on the right side is a sign of greater honor. For the right side is more honorable, and especially in chairs located next to each other. So that if two chairs are placed next to the wall, and one does not dominate the other, there cannot be any doubt but that the right one is more distinguished; however, another reason relates to the approach, as when one is larger than the other.

Therefore it is probable that, in the beginning, Paul was portrayed to the right of Peter, as the younger and less important; accordingly, in pontifical documents Paul is placed to the right of Peter in such a way that he precedes him, and almost covers him completely, which is an argument for deference in Paul and dignity in Peter. But that later he begins to be portrayed to the right, even when he does not touch, or when Christ or the Blessed Virgin have the middle place, it seems to have been done out of ignorance, that is, somewhere they had seen Paul depicted at the right, and they did not advert to the fact that Paul was placed on the right in order to protect Peter; hence they thought it was done out of honor for Paul, and on that account, in the chairs also, or when they were placed far apart, they gave the right place to Paul.

Moreover, it can be proved from the ancient Fathers that it was not done for the sake of Paul's honor, because in all other matters Peter is always put before Paul. If they are named, Peter comes first; if they are invoked in prayers, Peter comes first; if feast days in their honor are to be celebrated, Peter is first. Why therefore in images is this order in general usually changed?

Finally, if these points are not approved by some, it can be admitted that for the sake of honor Paul is placed on Peter's right in signs and images, and there seem to be especially three reasons for this honor.

First, since he seems to have done more for the Church than Peter; for, he brought more Gentiles to faith in Christ; he traveled through more provinces working very hard; he left us more very helpful writings.

But the Church, in cultivating the memory of the Saints, does not look so much at the level of honor which they had on earth, as she does to the help they proved for posterity. For, since she honors them out of a sense of gratitude, she offers more devotion to those to whom she is more indebted. Certainly Stephen and Laurence were only deacons, of whom the former served St. James the bishop and Apostle and the latter served St.

Sixtus, the Sovereign Pontiff. However, the Church honors Stephen more than James, and Laurence more than Sixtus, because the brilliant martyrdom of these two deacons shed light on the whole Church in a wonderful manner. But that Stephen and Laurence are honored by the Church more than James and Sixtus is seen from the fact that their feast days have an octave, while the feast days of the latter do not.

Similarly, St. Jerome and St. Thomas Aquinas were simple priests; Anthony, Benedict, Francis were not even priests, nevertheless by the Church, in what pertains to devotion, they take precedence over many saints, bishops, martyrs, and sovereign pontiffs, because the former benefited the Church more with their writings and books, and the latter with the institution of religious orders.

Another reason is that Paul was especially the teacher of the Gentiles, and Peter of the Jews. This is so that the Church might signify that the Gentiles are placed before the Jews, by him who said: *The elder shall serve the younger* (Gen. 25:23), she placed Paul before Peter.

A third reason can be that Peter was called by Christ, when he was still mortal and in a certain sense constituted on the left, while Paul was called from heaven by the immortal Christ, as reigning and sitting at the right hand of the Father. This reason is mentioned also by Peter Damian in the letter to Desiderius, which he wrote on this very point, by Innocent III in a sermon on the gospel, and by St. Thomas in lecture 1 on the letter to the Galatians.

Peter Damian also adds a fourth reason, namely, because Paul was from the tribe of Benjamin, and in him Benjamin is demonstrated and expressed typically in the Scriptures. Further, Benjamin, although he was the last among his brothers, still by his father he was called the son on his right side, and he was preferred to all his brothers by Joseph. On this see Gen. 35 and 42.

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE OBJECTION CONCERNING THE FIFTEEN SINS OF ST. PETER, PROPOSED BY THE MAGDEBURGENSES, IS REFUTED

The last argument is taken from the horrible faults of St. Peter, which the Magdeburgenses enumerate in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 10, columns 558, 559, 560, and they say that they have been recorded for us not without the assistance of the Holy Spirit, lest too much honor be given to Peter—which is something God foresaw would take place in later centuries.

They say that the first fault is found in Matt. 14:28 where Peter, as they say, out of curiosity, asked the Lord to summon him to come to him walking on the water. Therefore, afterwards he was punished, and he fell into a greater sin, because of his doubts.

I respond that there is no sin of Peter in this event, but on the contraiy he shows singular faith. For, if Peter sinned in asking to come to the Lord on the water, he would not have obtained what he requested. For the miracles of God do not cooperate with our sins. Therefore Maximus in sermon 1 on birth of the apostles said: *This is Peter, whom the subject waters proved by his walking on them that he has the utmost confidence in Christ. For, as a believer he requested from the Lord that he be given firm steps on the waves, and as a beloved disciple he merited it. And it seems that he began to fear only because his human weakness recognized how great a distance there is between the Lord and the servant.* And after that: *Truly there was a blessed and extraordinary faith of Peter, even while he was afraid, which the fear of the pressing danger could not perturb. For, as he was sinking he called out, "Lord, save me"; thus he had no confidence in himself, but he had no doubts about the Lord. Therefore, no one should interpret this fear of glorious Peter as a fault, etc.*

Secondly, they cite Matt. 16:22 where Peter said to Christ: *God forbid, Lord! This shall never happen to you.* The Magdeburgenses say that with these words Peter committed a foul and horrible fault. And then they say: *With these words a horrible fault is described, by which he would have merited eternal damnation, unless he was saved by God's great mercy. And there is no doubt but that he prayed earnestly for forgiveness of such a great sin.*

I respond: St. Jerome judged this matter very differently. For, he said about Matt. 14:28: *In every place the ardent faith of Peter is found. When the disciples were asked whom do men say that Jesus is, he confesses that he is the Son of God; when Jesus will to go to his passion, Peter forbids it; and although he errs in understanding, still he does not err in his affection.* And on Matt. 16:22 he said: *This apostolic error, coming from his affection of filial piety, seems to me not to have been a temptation of the devil.*

Thirdly they cite what Peter says in Matt. 17:4: *Lord, it is well that we are here; if you wish, I will make three booths here, etc.* They say: *Peter sinned, because contrary to the word of God he wanted to institute a memorial and worship of that event. Indeed also by the voice of the heavenly Father the superstition of Peter is reproved.*

I respond: that Peter in no way sinned is clear from Mark 9:6, where Mark says:

He did not know what he was saying, for they were exceedingly afraid. Therefore, Peter was in a sense transported out of himself, when he said that, and although he could have erred in such a state of mind, certainly he could not in any way commit a sin. Indeed, Chrysostom teaches in reference to this place that these words flowed from the great fervor of Peter: *You see,* he said, *with what great love of Christ he was consumed; for, you should not ask about how prudently he spoke, but how fervent his love of Christ was and how inflamed he was.*

Moreover, it is amazing why a new cult in memory of the transfiguration is judged to be a superstition by the Magdeburgenses, since Peter says clearly: *It is good that we are here.* Therefore he wanted to build booths not in memory of some thing of the past, but for the present dwelling with the glorious Christ. Hence Leo in his sermon on the transfiguration says that what Peter asked for was good, but not really proper, because it was not yet the time to proclaim his gloiy. But Peter did not sin in seeking his gloiy before the time, because he did not know what he was saying.

They place the fourth fault in the fact that Peter was one, and perhaps not the last of the number of those who raised the question about which one of them would be the greatest (Matt. 18:1). So Christ was forced to rebuke this ignorance and ambition with grave words.

But Scripture nowhere says that Peter was among that number. On Matt. 18 the Fathers—Origen, Chrysostom, Jerome, and others—say that not Peter, but other disciples raised that question, because they suspected that Peter would be placed before all of them. And this is gathered from the gospel itself. For, since Matthew said at the end of chapter 17 that Peter was sent to the sea, he then adds at the beginning of chapter 18: *At that time the disciples came to Jesus, saying: Who is the greatest?* With these words he indicates that, when Peter was absent, this question was raised. Thus during the time when Peter was sent to the sea, the other disciples approached the Lord.

They say that the fifth fault is found in Matt. 18:21, where Peter wanted to restrict the forgiveness of sins to seven times, saying: *How often shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? As many as seven times?* This is a childish trifle. For Peter did not want to restrict the number—he wanted to ask his master about it.

They place the sixth fault in what Peter says in Matt. 19:27: *Lo, we have left everything and followed you. What then shall we have?* There he seems to be thinking about some carnal rewards, and he also spoke arrogantly. But listen to the commentaiy of Chiysostom on this: *He says these things,* he said, *not from ambition or vain gloiy, but in order to include the poor people.* Also the Lord does not accuse Peter of being a sinner, but he promises him the greatest rewards.

They list the seventh fault in what Peter said in John 13:8: *You shall never wash my feet. Peter,* they say, *out of a certain stupidity and perverse devotion says that he will allow Christ to wash his feet.*

I respond that the holy Fathers have a completely different view of Peter's action here. Augustine on this place says that Peter did that by refusing the same thing that any of the other Apostles would have done. Chrysostom on this place said: *It was a sign of his love and reverence.* And after that: *He spoke thus because of his great love.* Likewise:

In refusing Peter is impetuous, and in permitting it even more impetuous, in both cases it is done out of love. Basil in a sermon on the judgment of God speaking about this matter said: *He gave no sign of sin, no sign of contempt, but rather he showed great honor towards the Lord, and he manifested suitable reverence as a servant and disciple.* Cyril in book 9, chapter 4 on John said: *Rightly was the faithful servant afraid of the meaning of such a great thing, and as a result of his customary reverence he refused.*

They say that the eighth fault is what Peter said in Matt. 26:33: *Though they all fall away because of you, I will never fall away;* for it seems that he wants to accuse the Lord of lying, because he had predicted that Peter would deny him.

But listen to what Jerome says about this text: *It is not temerity, or a lie, but the faith of the Apostle Peter, and ardent affection towards the Savior.* Listen to Chrysostom: *From where,* he said, *did that come to you?—certainly from much love and fi'om much good will.* Therefore, this was either no fault at all, or it was an excess of love and filial piety.

They put the ninth fault in the fact that in the garden, having been told to watch and pray, he fell asleep. But the Evangelist excuses him and the other apostles, saying: *They were sleeping, for their eyes were heavy.* And surely since it was very late at night, I do not see why it was such a grave sin to be overcome by sleep.

They take the tenth fault from Matt. 26:51, where Peter cut off the ear of Malchus: *Against the prohibition of Christ,* they say, *he used his sword, and with a rash and impious blow he cut off the ear of Malchus, the high priest's slave.* And after that: *With violence he tries as much as he can to impede the plan of God predicted in Scripture.*

Now first of all it is a lie that Peter used his sword contrary to the prohibition of Christ. For, the Lord had not predicted anything about the use of the sword, except what is had in Luke 22:36: *Let him who has no sword sell his mantle and buy one.* And when the disciples said: *Look, here are two swords, etc.,* Christ responded: *It is enough,* that is, Avo *swords are enough.* Although with these words he did not really command that they use the sword, still much less did he forbid it.

And although later the Lord did not reprove the deed of Peter, because he did not need that defense, nevertheless the Lord did not reprimand the thinking of Peter, and the holy Fathers also praise him. Chrysostom in homily 85 on Matthew said: *Consider the devout love and humility of the disciple. For it is one thing to strike Malchus out of loving fervor; but it is something else that out of obedience he replaced the sword in its scabbard.* Cyril in book 9, chapter 35 on John said: *The intention of Peter, who raised his sword against enemies, was not contrary to the command of the law.* Ambrose on Luke 22:36 said: *Peter knew the law and was motived by love; he knew that Phinehas, known for his justice, slew the man of Israel because of sacrilege.*

Therefore it is a blasphemy when the Magdeburgenses say that Peter did that with a bad intention, and tried to hinder the plan of God with violence. For he made that defense not out of hatred for the plan of God, but out of love for his master.

The eleventh fault for them was Peter's denial, which we do not deny was a grave sin, but there is no question that this sin was opposed to the primacy, as it rather confirms it. For, Gregory in homily 21 on the gospel says the following: *We must consider why the omnipotent God permitted him, whom he had chosen to be placed over the whole Church,*

to be terrified by the voice of the maid servant and to deny himself. We know indeed that by his plan there was to be an act of great piety, that he who was to become the shepherd of the Church, should learn from his own sin how he should show mercy to others.

They locate the twelfth fault in the fact that when the Lord was captured by the Jews, Peter, the illustrious and passionate hero, fled from the scene.

Peter was not the only one who did that, but, as Matthew says in 26:56: *All the disciples forsook him and fled.* Then Peter, although at the beginning had fled, still soon returned: *But Peter followed him at a distance,* as we read in the same place. Note finally, that there does not seem to have been any sin in this flight. For, if they should have followed the Lord, either in order to defend him, or to offer themselves up for death, they should have followed him; but they already had understood that the Lord did not want any defense to be taken on his behalf. And they were not bound to offer themselves up for death, but rather had received a command to flee: *When they persecute you,* the Lord said in Matt. 10:23, *in one town, flee to another.*

They say that the thirteenth fault was after the resurrection, since Peter with great ardor ran to the sepulcher, but did not yet rightly understand the truth of the resurrection, as John points out in 20:9. But in the same place John defends both Peter and himself from this accusation, when he says: *For as yet they did not know the Scripture that he must rise from the dead.* Therefore, at the time Peter labored under a certain ignorance, but without any personal fault; for, he was not among those who do not want to know, in order to act well, but he simply did not know.

They place the fourteenth fault in the fact that in John 21:21 out of curiosity he asked about John: *What about this man?* For, being reprimanded by the Lord, he heard this: *If it is my will that he remain until I come, what is that to you? Follow me.* Moreover, if this must be called curiosity, it is worthy of pardon; for, as Chrysostom writes in his comments on this place—it happened because of Peter's great love for John. For he thought that John wanted to ask about himself, but did not dare to do it; accordingly, in order to please him, he asked the Lord.

They place the final fault in the fact that at Antioch he did not act according to the truth of the gospel; therefore, rightly he was reprimanded by Paul. In referring to this as a sin they are clearly imitating their ancient predecessors, namely, the heresiarch Marcion and the apostate Julian, who said that Peter was reprimanded by Paul for a grave sin. Already a long time ago Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion and Cyril in book 9 against Julian refuted these calumnies. Here is what really happened.

When the Apostle Peter was living in Antioch, out of a sense of Christian freedom he ate food with the Gentiles. In the meantime certain Jews arrived, who were sent to Peter by the Apostle James. Then Peter began to think that he could hardly avoid giving offense either to the Gentiles or to the Jews. For, if he went to eat with the Gentiles, doubtless he would offend the Jews, who, since they were still weak in the faith, could not yet persuade themselves that it was allowed for Jews to eat with Gentiles. But if he separated himself from the Gentiles, and took food separately with the Jews, he would give an offense to the Gentiles, because they would either complain about the fickleness of Peter, or they would also begin to act like Jews following the example of such a great

man. Therefore, in this state of indecision the blessed Apostle chose what he thought was the lesser evil, that is, because he was the Apostle especially of the Jews, he would offend the Gentiles rather than the Jews. But Paul did not approve of that choice, and he reprimanded Peter quite sharply.

Now the Greek Fathers want to excuse Peter of any sin in this matter, as is clear from their commentaries on Gal. 2, and St. Jerome agrees with them, both in his commentary on the same letter, and in his letter 89 to Augustine. However, several of the Latin authors acknowledge some sin in this action of Peter, like Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion, Cyprian in his letter to Quintus, Ambrose on Gal. 2, Augustine in his letters 8, 9 and 19 to Jerome, Gregory in book 28, chapter 12 of his Morality, and some others.

Furthermore, without doubt that sin was either venial, or very slight, or perhaps it was only a sin materially, that is, an error of some kind, but without any guilt on Peter's part, since it is certain that he acted with the best intention.

But the reason for the error in his choice was either some lack of consideration, and then the sin was venial, or it was due to a defect of enlightenment and a certain involuntary ignorance, and then he did it without any fault on his part. But it is probable that in divine providence he did it so that in that affair the mind of Paul rather than that of Peter would be manifested, and so that we might have a useful example both of freedom in Paul and of patience and of humility in Peter.

BOOK TWO

On the succession of the Roman Pontiff in that primacy

CHAPTER I

A QUESTION IS PROPOSED: WHETHER ST. PETER WAS IN ROME AND DIED THERE AS ITS BISHOP?

Having established the things that pertain to the explanation and defense of the primacy of Peter, now we have to treat the matters that pertain to the primacy of his successors. But since the right of succession of the Roman Pontiffs is based on the fact that Peter located his chair in Rome at the command of the Lord, and presided there until his death, the first question presents itself: *Whether Peter was the bishop of Rome and never moved his See from there to another place.*

Many contemporary heretics call into doubt what already over 1500 years was believed continually by the whole world, namely, that St. Peter was the bishop of Rome, and that he rendered his soul back to God in Rome by his martyrdom by crucifixion. Some treat this argument quite modestly, others do it quite impudently.

The first one I know of who taught that St. Peter was not the bishop of Rome, and had never even seen Rome, was a certain Gulielmus who was the teacher of John Wycliffe, as Thomas Waldensis recounts in book 2, article 1, chapter 7 on the doctrine of the faith. The Lutheran Udalricus Velenus followed him, and he published a whole book on this matter; in it he thinks he can prove with 18 persuasions (that is what he calls them) that Peter was never in Rome, and that both Peter and Paul were killed not in Rome, but in Jerusalem. For his work, he says at the end of the book that without doubt he will receive from God the reward of an everlasting crown. And surely if lies are given a crown by God, without any doubt Velenus will receive a splendid crown.

Illyricus also in the book against the primacy of the Pope said: *The demonstration is certain that Peter was never in Rome.* John Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 § 15 of his Institutes, after he shows that the whole matter is doubtful, concludes by saying this: *However, because of the consensus of the authors, I do not deny that he died there, but that he was the bishop, especially for a long time, I cannot be persuaded.* The Magdeburgenses say something similar in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 10, col. 561.

However, it is to be observed that there are four points that are called into doubt First, was Peter in Rome? Second, did he die in Rome? Third, was he the bishop of Rome? Having become the bishop of Rome, is it true that he never moved?

Of these four, only the last one is both necessary and sufficient to establish the primacy of the Roman Pontiff. This is the reason why Calvin in no way admitted this fourth point, since he had little concern for the other three. For it is obvious that the

first one is neither required nor sufficient, since many people come to Rome, but they never become the Roman Pontiffs, and many Roman Pontiffs were never in Rome, like Clement V, John XXII, Benedict XII, Clement VI, Innocent VI, who were consecrated in France and never left it.

Likewise many Roman Pontiffs, who died outside of Rome, testify that the second point is not required and is not sufficient. For, Clement I died in Pontus, Pontianus in Sardinia, John I in Ravenna, Agapitus in Constantinople, Innocent III in Perugia, Innocent IV in Naples, John XX in Viterbo, and others in various places. Many more bear witness to the same thing, since they die daily in Rome, but they are not Roman Pontiffs.

That the third point is required, but is not sufficient, is gathered from the fact that Peter was the bishop of Antioch and still since he moved his See elsewhere, after that the bishops of Antioch never had the first place. Therefore, only the fourth point is both required and sufficient. However, since all four are true, we will prove each one with its own arguments.

CHAPTER II

PETER WAS IN ROME

To begin at the beginning, we will show that St. Peter was for some time in Rome; we will show it first from the testimony of Peter himself, who says this at the end of his first letter: *She who is at Babylon, who is likewise chosen, sends you greetings; and so does my son Mark.* Papias, a disciple of the Apostles, is a witness that this letter was written from Rome, which is called Babylon by Peter. This is found in book 2, chapter 15 in Eusebius's History where he said: *Papias says that Peter in his first letter, which he wrote from Rome, mentions Mark; also figuratively he calls Rome Babylon, when he says: "She who is at Babylon, who is likewise chosen, sends you greetings; and so does my son Mark."*

Jerome also testifies to this in his book on illustrious men, in the essay on Mark, when he says: *Peter in the first letter under the name of Babylon figuratively speaks about Rome: The Church greets you,* he said, *which is assembled in Babylon.* In the same way it is explained by Oecumenius, Bede, and all those who published commentaries on this letter.

Moreover, John in the Apocalypse passim calls Rome Babylon, as Tertullian says in book 3 against Marcion, and in the book against the Jews, and it is clearly gathered from chapter 17 of the Apocalypse, where it is said that the great Babylon is seated on seven hills, and has dominion over the kings of the earth. For, there is no other city, which at the time of John had dominion over the kings of the earth, but Rome, and it was well know that Rome was built on seven hills.

Finally, the adversaries passim proclaim that Rome is the Babylon of the Apocalypse. Therefore, Luther wrote a book about the Babylonian Captivity, and the Magdeburgenses accept the Apocalypse among the number of the divine books for no other reason than that in the book many things are said against Rome under the name of Babylon (see Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 56). Wherefore if Rome in the Scriptures is Babylon, as they say, and Peter wrote from Babylon, then certainly he wrote from Rome.

Velenus responds: *And the true Babylon,* he says, *was twofold—one being in Assyrio, the other in Egypt, which is now called Chagrum; from this it follows that Peter wrote from Assyria or from Egypt, but not from Italy, when he wrote from Babylon.*

But what Velenus says has no value. For, Peter is not speaking about Babylon in the proper sense, but about the city which figuratively in the Apocalypse is said to be Babylon, which we have shown from several sources. Certainly these sources have more credibility than what Velenus says, who was not able to quote any author in support of his explanation. Otherwise let Velenus answer us: If there was no Babylon outside of Assyria and Egypt, where is that Babylon which in the Apocalypse is said to have dominion over the kings of the earth? For it is certain that it applies to neither Assyria nor Egypt.

But Velenus insists: *If in Peter,* he says, *by the name Babylon they understand Rome, as it is also found in John; then all those who are leaving the Roman Church are acting correctly.* For in Apocalypse 18:2 we read this: *Fallen, fallen is Babylon the great! It has*

become a dwelling place of demons, a haunt of every foul spirit, etc. And again: *Come out of her, my people, lest you take part in her sins, lest you share in her plagues.*

I respond that Babylon here is called, not the Roman Church, but the Roman city, as it was at the time of John. For, Tertullian in book 3 against Marcion explains how the original Babylon was the head of an empire, and had as its king Nebuchadnezzar, who persecuted the people of God, and led them away into captivity; so also Rome at the time of the Apostles was the head of an empire, and had Nero as Emperor, who cruelly persecuted the people of God.

However, John predicts that this Babylon will fall, because the Roman Empire was to be destroyed. And we know that this actually happened. For, did not the Goths, the Vandals, the Huns, the Langobardians reduce the empire of the city of Rome to almost nothing?

He calls the same Babylon the dwelling place of demons, the haunt of every foul spirit, because as St. Leo says in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles: *Since it ruled over all the Gentiles, it accommodated the errors of all the Gentiles.* And about the words, *Come out of her, my people,* he says it is understood spiritually, not physically, as Augustine explains in his Short Collation 3. For, John commands that the saints should not be joined together with pagans and idolaters by imitating their morals and way of life, even though they can be with them in the same city. Hence also it is certain that, because of these words of John, the Christians never left the city.

Therefore St. Jerome in a letter to Marcella, who in the name of Paula and Eustochium urged her to move from Rome to Bethlehem, after quoting these words from the Apocalypse against Rome, adds immediately: *It is true that Rome has a holy church, trophies of apostles and martyrs, a true confession of Christ. The faith has been preached there by an apostle, heathenism has been trodden down, the name of Christian is daily exalted higher and higher, etc.*

With these words he is not teaching that John spoke against the Roman Church, but against the Roman pagan way of life. And in book 2, near the end, against Jovinianus, he addresses Rome in this way: *I am speaking to you, who have a blasphemy written on your forehead, that you abominate the faith of Christ.*

Secondly, the same thing is proved from Acts 28 and from the letter to the Romans. For it is certain from these places that there were many Christians in Rome, indeed that the Church was large and flourishing before Paul arrived there. Therefore I ask: who made them Christians, if Peter was not in Rome? For, many ancients write that Peter was the first of all to preach to the Romans, and that he founded the Church there before the arrival of Paul. But that someone else did it cannot be proved by any solid argument.

Certainly Irenaeus says in book 3, chapter 3 that the Roman Church was founded by Peter and Paul, that is, first by Peter, then by Peter and Paul together. Eusebius in book 2, chapter 14 of his History says about Peter: *By the word of his salutary preaching he was the FIRST in the city of Rome to open the door of the kingdom of heaven with the keys of his gospel.* Amobius in book 2 against the Gentiles says that Rome was converted to Christ, because it saw that the flaming chariot of Simon Magus, put out by the mouth of Peter, disappeared immediately at the invocation of the name of Christ.

Epiphanius in Heresies 27 said: *The first ones in Rome were Peter and Paul.* Chrysostom on Psalm 49: *Since Peter the fisherman occupied the very royal city, after his death it shone more clearly than the sun.*

Paul Orosius in book 7, chapter 6 of his History said: *At the beginning of the reign of Claudius Peter, the Apostle of our Lord Jesus Christ, came to Rome, and with faithful words he taught the salutary faith to all; he gave witness to the faith by his outstanding virtues, and because of him* (note this) *there began to be Christians in Rome.* Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles: *For when the twelve Apostles... had distributed the world into parts among themselves, and undertaken to instruct it in the Gospel, the most blessed Peter, chief of the Apostolic band, was appointed to the citadel of the Roman empire.* Theodoretus in his comments on Rom. 1 said: *First of all the great Peter preached the evangelical doctrine to them* (the Romans). Gregory of Tours in book 1, chapter 25 of his History, where he had said that Peter came to Rome under Claudius, added this: *From those days there began to be Christians in the Roman city.*

The Emperor Theodosius, in the Catechism on the Trinity and the Catholic Faith 1, *"Cunctos Populos,"* said: *We want all the peoples, whom the dominion of our clemency rules, to be instructed in the religion, which was given to us and declares that St. Peter the Apostle handed it on to the Romans.*

Then there is the prophecy of the Erythraean Sibyl, who among other things predicted that Christ would conquer the Aenean city not with the sword and war, but with the hook of a fisherman. Nicolas Sanderus in book 7, page 250, of his book on visible monarchy mentions this prophecy. Velenus responds that immediately after the passion of Chnst, during the time of Tiberius, there were Christians in Rome; as witnesses to this he cites Orosius in book 7 of his History, Tertullian in his Apology, Platina in the life of Christ and Tranquillus in his life of Tiberius. From this it follows that the Church was not founded by Peter, for he is said to have come to Rome for the first time during the time of Claudius.

Let us add in favor of Velenus the testimony of Clement in book 1 of the Recognitions, where we read that Barnabas preached in Rome during the time of Tiberius. Dorotheus of Tyre followed him in this and says in a synopsis that Barnabas was the first one to preach in Rome.

I respond that it is not true that there were any Christians in Rome at the time of Tiberius; and what the Fathers say is true, namely, that Peter was the first one to preach to the Romans, and that he did it under Claudius. For, of the four authors cited by Velenus, the two oldest ones, Tranquillus and Tertullian, do not say this, and Velenus clearly is lying, although in his preface he piously swears by his conscience that he does not want to indulge in any lie or any fraud. For, Tranquillus in his life of Tiberius does not mention Christians, but he does in the life of Claudius, where he says that the Jews, causing a disturbance because of Christ, were expelled from Rome by Claudius. This of course favors our opinion, since we contend that Christians began to appear in Rome during the time of Claudius.

Tertullian, however, in the Apology holds a contrary opinion. For he says that Pilate wrote from Palestine to Tiberius about the resurrection of Christ, and that by many he

was believed to be God; and that Tiberius asked the senate whether Christ should be accepted as God; then that the senate refused, because he had begun to be considered as God by the people, as Pilate had written, before he was deified by the senate. From this narration it cannot be concluded that at that time there were Christians in Rome, but rather that there were not any; for if there were some, Tiberius would have known the fame of Christ before he received a letter from Pilate.

Next, Orosius, whom Platina followed, added to the words of Tertullian that the Senate decreed that Christians should be banished from the city, which is not to be understood in the sense that then there were Christians in the city. For, the same Orosius in book 7 clearly states that there were no Christians in Rome until after the arrival of Peter, and that Peter arrived when Claudius was Emperor. Therefore, the meaning of the decree of the senate was that the Christian religion was not to be accepted in any way, and if some Christians arrived they were to be driven out of the city. But this edict had no force, for as Orosius says in the same place, Tiberius decreed a punishment for the accusers of Christians.

Regarding the statement about Barnabas, I respond that it is not probable that Barnabas preached to the Romans during the time of Tiberius. For it is certain that no one dared to preach to Gentiles before Peter was advised by a heavenly vision, recounted in Acts 10 and 11. But after that time Barnabas was always together with Paul until the conclusion of the Council of Jerusalem in the 18th year after the passion of the Lord, as is gathered from St. Paul in Gal. 1 and 2, which was thirteen years after the death of Tiberius. Therefore Barnabas did not go to Rome during the time of Tiberius.

Add to this that the books of Recognitions are considered to be apocryphal. In addition, the synopsis which is falsely attributed to Dorotheus of Tyre is full of invented and mendacious narrations. For (and I am omitting other things) how can that author be defended, since he numbers among the 72 disciples the eunuch of the queen of Ethiopia, who was converted by Philip after the Ascension; and he makes Junia a bishop, who certainly was a woman? And how can it be that the Caesar, whom Paul mentions in his letter to the Philippians, was a disciple of Christ and a bishop, since it is obvious he was speaking about the Caesar Nero?

Finally add this: if we accept the books of Recognitions, and the synopsis of Dorotheus, still Velenus gains very little or nothing at all. For the same Clement, whom Dorotheus followed, in the same place says that Barnabas accomplished nothing in Rome, and immediately after his first sermon, having made no converts, he returned to Judea.

Thirdly, it is proved from the Gospel of Mark. For the important authors constantly write that Mark wrote his Gospel in Rome, according as he heard Peter preaching there. This is what Eusebius writes in book 2, chapter 15 of his History, relying on Papias, and also Clement of Alexandria. Irenaeus says the same thing in book 2, chapter 1, and Jerome in the essay on Mark in his book on illustrious men, and Damasus in the life of Peter. Isidore says the same in his life of Mark, and Ado in the Chronicle of the year 45. Finally, Tertullian in book 4 against Marcion says that the Gospel of Mark is to be attributed to Peter, because Mark was the translator for Peter, and his disciple, just as the Gospel of Luke is attributed to Paul. *And it may well seem,* he said, *that the works which*

disciples publish belong to their masters.

Velenus responds that all those are deceived, who do not know that there were two Marks, one who was called John Mark, who was mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles in chapters 12 and 15, and another one who was called Mark Aristarchus, who is mentioned in the letter to Philemon. Of these two he says that the first one wrote the gospel and was the bishop of Alexandria, and a disciple and follower of Peter, but that he never saw Rome; he says that the second one was with Paul in Rome, but did not write the gospel. Then, he says, the old Fathers, knowing about the two Marks, attributed it to one; therefore they fell into the error of thinking that the Mark in Rome wrote the gospel.

Now our Velenus has committed three sins: one, that he thinks in the letter to Philemon that Mark Aristarchus is one man, since clearly they are two; for Paul says this: *Epaphrus, my fellow prisoner in Christ Jesus, sends greetings to you, and so do Mark, Aristarchus, Demas, and Luke, my fellow workers.* And it is clearer in Col. 4:10: *Aristarchus my fellow prisoner greets you, and Mark the cousin of Barnabas.*

The second sin is that he wants Mark never to have been in Rome, because he was the bishop of Alexandria, as if he could not be sent by St. Paul from Rome to Alexandria, or also to come from Alexandria to Rome, and again to return from Rome to Alexandria.

The third sin is that he says the gospel was written by John Mark. For, John Mark was the cousin of Barnabas, and a disciple of Paul, as is gathered from Acts 12 and 15, and from Col. 4, and he lived until the fourteenth year of Nero. But Paul in 2 Tim., which he wrote in the fourteenth year of Nero, with his martyrdom being imminent, ordered Mark to come to him. But Mark the Evangelist and bishop of Alexandria was killed in Nero's eighth year, as Eusebius says in the Chronicle, and Jerome writes in his essay on Mark in his book on the illustrious men.

Fourthly, this same point can be proved from the history of Simon Magus, who was overcome gloriously by Peter at Rome; that this is true we proved above with many testimonies of the old Fathers. Finally, we can add all the arguments, by which in the following chapter we will make clear that St. Peter suffered martyrdom for Christ at Rome; for, someone who was never in Rome could not die in Rome.

CHAPTER III

ST. PETER DIED IN ROME

Now that St. Peter not only at some time came to Rome, but also in Rome together with Paul laid down his life for the glory of Christ is proved first of all by their tombs. For, if Peter and Paul did not die in Rome, who brought their bodies to Rome? Whence, and when and by which witnesses was that done? If perhaps they should respond: the bodies of the Apostles are not in Rome, where, I ask, are they? Certainly they are not said to be anywhere else. And it is not likely that the bodies of these great Apostles were neglected, since we see that so many bodies of the other saints have been carefully preserved.

Eusebius placed such importance on this argument that he thought it is superfluous to seek any other. For in book 2, chapter 25 of his history he says this: *Nero was the first of the emperors who showed himself an enemy of the divine religion... he was led on to the slaughter of the Apostles. It is, therefore, recorded that Paul was beheaded in Rome itself and that Peter likewise was crucified under Nero. This account of Peter and Paul is substantiated by the fact that their names are preserved in the cemeteries of that place even to the present day.*

Then the consensus of the whole world bears witness to this same thing, which is derived especially from the pilgrimages to the tombs of the Apostles. For, Nicolas I writes in his letter to Michael that so many thousands of people from all parts of the world, because of their religion, stream to the tombs of the Apostles, that the city of Rome alone shows sufficiently that the Church of Christ is Catholic or universal, since from every race of men many people are seen always at the tombs of Peter and Paul.

But the adversaries do not deny that all Christians were convinced, until the time of John Wycliffe, that is, until about the year 1400, that St. Peter was in Rome and died there. But it is not at all credible that in such a long period of time that there never was anyone who detected that error, if it was an error, especially since it was something, which the whole world believed for so long, that was not done in some remote place, and in a moment, and without witnesses, so that it could be easily invented and could be refuted with difficulty. For we say that St. Peter worked for many years in Rome as its bishop, and finally after having thoroughly overcome Simon Magus, at the command of a powerful emperor famous for his cruelty, he finished his life by being crucified upside down. How credible is it that such an event, which we say was so well known, is false, and that there was no one for 1400 years who refuted it?

Lastly, the testimonies of the ancient Greek and Latin Fathers bear witness to the same thing. Ignatius, who lived at the time of the Apostles, in his letter to the Romans, a large part of which St. Jerome includes in his essay on Ignatius in his book on illustrious men, when asking the Romans not to hinder his passion, says: *I do not command you like Peter and Paul, etc.;* with these words he seems to allude to the suffering of Peter and Paul, which some of them had tried to hinder. For, with their tears they had urged him to leave the city, when Nero was seeking his death. Therefore Ignatius says, although I cannot command you, as Peter and Paul could, nevertheless I beseech you, do not try to

stop me, as you tried to stop them.

Dionysius of Corinth, who lived a hundred years after the death of the Apostles, when he was in Rome, as Eusebius reports in book 2, chapter 25 of his History, among other things says this: *Both were teaching in this city at the same time and were crowned together with martyrdom at the same time.* Caius, who lived about 50 years after Dionysius, in the same place in Eusebius is quoted as saying: *But I can show the trophies of the Apostles. For if you will go to the Vatican or to the Ostian way, you will find the trophies of those who laid the foundations of this Church.*

Hegesippus, who lived near the time of the Apostles, in book 3, chapter 2 of his book on the destruction of Jerusalem recounts the whole history at great length. Adding to what the previous authors reported, he says that Peter was crucified upside down, at his own request. Eusebius, in the Chronicle for the year 71 after the birth of Christ, said this: *Nero in addition to all his crimes also began to persecute Christians, and in that persecution Peter and Paul gloriously laid down their lives in Rome.*

Theodoretus in a letter to Pope Leo, when speaking about Rome, said: *It has the fellowship of the Fathers, and the tombs of Peter and Paul, teachers of the truth, which enlighten the souls of the faithful.* Origen in book 3 on Genesis, as Eusebius reports in book 3, chapter 1 of his History, said the following: *And at last, having come to Rome, Peter was crucified head-downwards; for he had requested that he might suffer in this way, lest he seem to be equal to the Lord.* Athanasius in the Apology for his flight said: *When Peter and Paul heard that it was necessary for them to suffer martyrdom, they did not reject that departure but embraced it with joy.*

Chiysostom in homily 32 on the letter to the Romans said: *Heaven does not shine as much, when the sun sends forth it rays from itself, as the city of Rome does when pouring forth those two lights everywhere on earth. From here Paul will be snatched away, from here Peter. Look, and shudder at what kind of spectacle Rome is going to see, namely, Paul together with Peter suddenly rising from that tomb and being carried aloft to meet the Lord.*

Of the Latins, Tertullian says in his work on prescription: *Since, moreover, you are close upon Italy, you have Rome, from which there comes even into our own hands the very authority (of Apostles themselves). How happy is its Church, on which Apostles poured forth all their doctrine along with their blood! Where Peter endures a passion like his Lord's! Where Paul wins his crown in a death like John's.* Lactantius in book 4, chapter 21 of the Divine Institutes said: *Christ at his departure revealed to his disciples all that was going to happen, which Peter and Paul preached in Rome.* And after that: *Since Nero killed them, and Vespasian destroyed the people, he did everything they said was going to happen.*

Ambrose in the Oration against Auxentius, which is contained in book 5 of his letters, said: *At night he (Peter) begins to leave the town, and seeing Christ coming to meet him at the gate, and entering the city, says: Lord, where are You going? Christ answers: I am coming to be crucified again. Peter understood the divine answer to refer to his own cross.* And after that: *He was immediately seized, and glorified the Lord Jesus by his cross.*

Jerome in the essay on Peter in his book on illustrious men said: *Simon Peter went to Rome in order to subdue Simon the Magician, and there he occupied the sacerdotal chair for 25 years until the last, that is the 14th year of Nero, by whom he was nailed to a cross and crowned with martyrdom, with his head turned down towards the earth.* Augustine in book 1, chapter 10 on the Holy Gospel said: *Because of the same day of their suffering, with great solemnity Rome commemorates the merits of Peter and Paul.* Maximus in sermon 5 on the birth of the Apostles said: *Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in the city of Rome, by which it obtained the dominion and head of the nations, that is, where the head of superstition had been, there the head of holiness reposes.*

Sulpitius in book 2 of his sacred histoiy said: *At that time, our divine religion had obtained a wide prevalence in the city. Peter was there executing the office of bishop, and Paul, too, after he had been brought to Rome.* And after that: *At that time Paul and Peter were condemned to death, the former being beheaded with a sword, while Peter suffered crucifixion.* Paul Orosius in book 7 of his history said: *For the first man of Rome* (Nero) *persecuted the Christians with punishments and death, and having tried to extirpate the very name, he killed the blessed Apostles of Christ—Peter with the cross, Paul with the sword.* Eutropius in book 7 of his life of Nero said: *Finally, he also added this to all his crimes—he slaughtered the holy Apostles of God, Peter and Paul.* Isidore in his life of Peter said: *In the thirty-seventh year after the passion of the Lord he was crucified by Nero Caesar in the city of Rome with his head toward the ground, as he wished.*

Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles said: *Today's festival, in addition to the reverence which he merited in the whole world, is to be venerated with the special rejoicing of our city, that where the departure of the principal Apostles is celebrated, there on the day of their martyrdom there may be an abundance of joy.* Gregory of Tours in book 1, chapter 25 said: *Nero ordered Peter to be killed by the cross and Paul by the sword.* Pope Gregory in book 6, letter 37, speaking about the Roman Church, said: *Peter exalted the chair in which he also deigned to rest and to finish his life on earth.*

Elpis, the wife of Boethius, said in a hymn on the Apostle:

O happy Rome, rejoice, you are made purple
With the precious blood of such great leaders.
You excel all the beauty of the world
Not by your praise, but by their merits.

I am omitting innumerable others, like Bede, Ado Freculpus, Bernard and others; indeed these can suffice, since they all lived in the first 1500 years, and since the adversaries until now have not been able to produce even one author who contradicts this. Finally, you can add the fact that the pagan authors, although they do not mention Peter and Paul, who seemed contemptible to them, by name, still they agree with the cited Fathers that at Rome Nero was the first to order the Christians to be killed, as is clear from Cornelius Tacitus in book 15 of his Annals, and from Suetonius on Nero.

Velenus has no answer to these testimonies, except what is said from some of the Fathers, namely, that Christ appeared to Peter at the Roman Gate and said: *I am coming*

to Rome to be crucified again. He says this is a horrible lie and blasphemy against Peter and the Holy Spirit. For, he says, Christ will never come down from heaven except on the day of judgment, as the Holy Spirit testifies through the mouth of Peter in Acts 3:21: (Jesus) *whom heaven must receive until the time for establishing all things.*

But really it is Velenus who lies and blasphemes, since he attempts to put chains on Christ, lest he be able to move until the Day of Judgment. For, (I will omit other apparitions of Christ, which are read about in approved authors) certainly in Acts 9:3ff. Christ located in the air near the ground appeared to Paul. For, that then Paul truly saw with his bodily eyes Christ present to him and near is clear both from the light, which flashed about him, and from the blindness, which happened to him after he saw the glorious Christ, as is said in the same place; it is also clear from the words of Scripture. For, in Acts 9:17 Ananias says to Paul: *The Lord Jesus who appeared to you on the road by which you came, has sent me.* And in the same place: *Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared to them how he had seen the Lord.* And Paul himself in 1 Cor. 9:1 says: *Am I not an apostle? Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?* And in 1 Cor. 15:8: *Last of all, as to one untimely born, he appeared also to me.* There he lists the witnesses of the resurrection, who had seen the Lord with their bodily eyes—and he places himself among them.

Therefore, concerning the words from Acts 3:21 I respond that Peter wanted to say that Christ will not come publicly and in the presence of all until the Day of Judgment; but that does not mean that he cannot appear privately and to whomever he wishes. It could also be said, and perhaps more probably: Christ without coming down from heaven could appear to Peter; for it is not difficult for God to bring it about that one body is in several places.

CHAPTER IV

PETER IN ROME WAS THE BISHOP UNTIL HIS DEATH

Two points remain which could be demonstrated together, namely, that Peter was the bishop of Rome, and that he retained his episcopacy until his death. The great dignity of the Roman Church seems to recommend the first point. For, by the consensus of all it has always been considered the first of all the Churches, as even Calvin admits; but no other reason can be given for this excellence, except that the prince of the Apostles was the real pastor of that Church, and its bishop, as we showed above, when we presented the 28 prerogatives of St. Peter.

Then, if Peter was not the bishop of Rome until his death, as the adversaries say, where was Peter located from the time when he left Antioch? For, the Antiochians themselves admit that Peter did not remain perpetually in Antioch, and that is sufficiently proved by the custom of the Church, which has never attributed the first place to the bishop of Antioch; and there is not or ever was any Church which claims that its bishop was Peter, except the Antiochian and the Roman; therefore, will we say that Peter was not the bishop of that place?

But the adversaries cannot say this, because they want Peter to have been, not the bishop of the whole Church, but only of some particular place, as John was of Ephesus, and James of Jerusalem. Let them say, therefore, where Peter was the bishop, or, if he was the bishop of Rome and afterwards moved his See, can they say where he moved it to?

Then there is the testimony and consensus of all the Old Fathers, which Calvin must accept, unless he wants to contradict himself. For he says, because of the consensus of the authors, that he does not want to deny that Peter died in Rome. Therefore, since the same authors with the greatest consensus say that Peter was the bishop of Rome, and none of the Ancients ever denied it, why can he not be persuaded that Peter exercised the episcopacy of Rome?

St. Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 2 composed a catalogue of the Roman bishops, and he put Peter and Paul in the first place, second Linus, third Anacletus, fourth Clement, and the others until Eleutherius, who was then the Pope; and by name he repeats concerning Clement, Sixtus, Eleutherius that they succeed the Apostles. Eleutherius is the twelfth; but really it cannot be said truly that the Roman bishops succeed Peter, if Peter was not the bishop of Rome.

Tertullian in his book on prescription said: *They develop the order of their bishops proceeding in such a way that the first bishop was one of the apostles, or one of the apostolic men.* And after that: *As the Church of the Romans makes known that Clement was ordained by Peter.* But he does not mean by that that Clement actually was ordained by Peter, but that Peter afterwards transferred the See to another is clear from the same book, where Tertullian writes that Peter was crucified at Rome; from this we understand that Clement was ordained by Peter, because Peter's death was imminent, and that therefore Clement succeeded Peter after his death.

St. Cyprian often calls the Roman See the Chair of Peter, and surely he would not say

this if he thought that Peter had moved his Chair to some place other than Rome. In book 1, letter 3 to Cornelius he said: *Travel to the chair of Peter, and to the principal Church, which is the source of priestly unity; carry letters from schismatics and pagans, but do not think they are Romans, to whom perfidy cannot have any access.* And in book 4, letter 2 to Antonianus he said: *Cornelius became bishop, when the place of Fabian, that is, the place of Peter and the office of the priestly Chair was vacant.*

Eusebius in the Chronicle of the year 44 said: *Peter was a Galilean, the first pontiff of Christians, since he was the first one to found the Church of Antioch. Then he came to Rome, where he preached the gospel for 25 years, continuing as the bishop of the same city.* Epiphanius in heresies 27, which is that of Carpocratis: *The succession of the bishops in Rome,* he said, *had this sequence: Peter and Paul, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Evaristus, Alexander, etc.*

Athanasius in a letter on leading a solitary life said: *First of all, they did not spare even the Roman bishop Liberius, nor did they show him reverence because that See is apostolic.* And after that he introduces Liberius speaking: *In the tradition we never received such a thing from the Father, which they received from the blessed and great Peter.* And there Liberius names Peter as being among his predecessors.

Dorotheus in the synopsis said: *Linus was bishop of Rome after Peter the Head.* Sozomenus in book 4, chapter 14 said: *Not without divine providence it happened that, after the death of Felix, Liberius alone presided over the Roman Church, lest the See of Peter be sullied by any stain of ill repute.* Eulogius in book 6, letter 37 of Gregory says that Peter now presides in Rome in his successors. Opatatus in book 2 against Parmenides said: *Therefore you cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the episcopal chair was bestowed first of all on Peter.* And after that he lists the Roman bishops from Peter to Siricius, who occupied the chair at his time.

Ambrose in book 3, chapter 1 on the sacraments said: *Indeed, the author for us of this assertion is the Apostle Peter, who was the priest of the Roman Church.* Jerome in his essay on Peter in his book on illustrious men says that he occupied the sacerdotal chair in Rome for 25 years. The same author in letter 1 to Damasus on the word "hypostasis" said this: *Since I am speaking to the successor of the fisherman and the disciple of the cross, I am in communion with your beatitude, that is, with the chair of Peter.* Augustine in book 2, chapter 51 against the opponents of Peter: *What did the chair of the Roman Church do for you—the chair in which Peter sits, and in which now Anastasius is sitting?* In letter 164 he also names all the bishops from Peter to Anastasius.

Prudentius in a hymn for St. Laurence:

Two princes of the Apostles
Are now ruling Rome:
One is the inviter of the Gentiles,
The other occupying the first
Chair opens the closed
Doors of eternity.

Prosper in the book on ingratitude:
Rome is the See of Peter, the place of pastoral honor;
It has become the head of the world, etc.

Sulpicius in book 2 on sacred history said: *The divine religion grew strong in the city while Peter was the bishop.* Bishop Peter of Ravenna in a letter to Eutychius, which is contained among the preambles for the Council of Chalcedon: *We exhort you honorable brother,* he said, *to pay obedient attention to what has been written by the most blessed Roman Pope, because St. Peter, who still lives and presides in his own See, presents the truth of the faith to those who are seeking it.*

Theodoretus in a letter to Leo, after he had said that Peter and Paul died in Rome, adds the following: *They made your See more renowned, it is the summation of your goods. But God now also has rendered their chair brilliant and distinguished, because he has placed you holiness in it, which sends forth rays of the orthodox faith.* Isidore in his life of Peter said: *After he founded the Church of Antioch, he went to Rome and overcame Simon Magus; and preaching the gospel there, he was its bishop for twenty-five years.* Those who say the same thing are Bede in the six ages, Freculphus in volume 2, book 1, chapter 13 of the Chronicle, Ado of Vienne in the Chronicle for the year of Christ 49, and all recent authors.

We can also add to the above the authority of so many Fathers, the testimonies of the old Roman pontiffs, martyrs or confessors. Clement I in book 7, chapter 46 on the Apostolic Constitution teaches that Peter, when his death was imminent, left the Roman episcopacy; Anacletus in letter 3 teaches that, because of the Chair of Peter, the Roman Church is the head of all the others. Marcellus I in his letter to Antioch said: *First the chair of Peter was among you, which by a command of the Lord was moved to Rome, etc.* Damasus on the pontificate of Peter says that Peter was the bishop of Rome for 25 years, that is, until his death. Innocent I in his letter to the Council of Mileum, which is #93 among the letters of Augustine; Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles; Gelasius in a letter to the bishops of Sicily; John III in a letter to the bishops of Germany and Gaul; Gregoiy in book 2, chapter 33; Agatho in a letter to the Emperor Constantine; Adrian In a letter to Tharasius; Nicolas I in a letter to Michael, and all the others who wrote something about his, say that their chair is the chair of Peter. Their testimonies are not accepted by the adversaries, because they say they were promoting their own cause; but certainly and undeservedly they are not accepted, since they were very holy men, and none of the ancient authors ever reprimanded them for errors in this matter.

Next there are the testimonies of the old Councils, which are accepted by the heretics of our time. First of all, in the Council of Sardis with 300 bishops, there is canon 3: *We honor the memory of St. Peter the Apostle, as it is written by those who have examined the case, while Julius is the Roman bishop, and if he decides that the judgment is to be renewed, let it be renewed, and let him appoint the judges.* Likewise in the Council of Ephesus I, in volume 1, chapter 16, Celestine the Roman pontiff is called *the ordinary successor and vicar of St. Peter, the prince of the Apostles.*

In the second session of the Council of Chalcedon, when the letter of Leo had been

read, all exclaimed: *Peter has spoken through Leo.* In session 3 when the decree against Dioscorus was passed, it is said that Leo, endowed with the dignity of the Apostle Peter, deposed Dioscorus. And in a letter to Leo the whole Council says that Leo was the interpreter of the voice of Peter, that is, that Peter had spoken through Leo. All of these facts clearly indicate that the 630 Fathers were convinced that the Roman Bishop Leo was the successor of Peter.

In Council 5, session 1 (which however is not the fifth general Council, but a particular Council, which preceded the fifth general Council. See below book 5 on the Councils, chapter 5) the patriarch Menas, president of the Council, passed sentence on Anthimus and some other heretics: *They have contemned,* he said, *the Roman Church, in which there is the successor of the Apostles, who passed judgment against them.* In session 8 of Council VI the bishops subscribe the letter of Agatho in various ways. Among other things, this is what it says: *I accept and embrace the direct suggestions prescribed as from the Holy Spirit by our holy father Agatho, archbishop of the apostolic and preeminent See of ancient Rome, from the mouth of the holy and blessed prince of the Apostles, Peter, and written by the hand of the threefold blessed Pope Agatho.* So from these five approved Councils we have more than 1200 ancient bishops, most of whom were Greeks, who bear witness that the Roman pontiff succeeds Peter.

CHAPTER V

THE FIRST ARGUMENT OF THE HERETICS IS REFUTED

Now we will answer the objections of Velenus, which also contain the arguments of Calvin and Illyricus. Their first persuasion is this. The authors who say that Peter came to Rome, do not agree among themselves about the time when he came; for, Orosius says that he came at the beginning of the reign of Claudius; Jerome says it was the second year of Claudius; a packet of letter of the times says that it was in the 4th year of the same Claudius, and an account of the lives of the saints put it in the 13th year of Claudius.

Moreover, an astonishing variety is found in the numbering of Peter's successors. For, some put Clement immediately after Peter, like Tertullian in his prescription and Jerome in comments on Isa. 52; others put Linus after Peter, and afterwards Clement in the third place, like Optatus in book 2 against Parmenides, and Augustine in letter 165; others after Peter put Linus and Cletus or Anacletus, and finally Clement in the fourth place, like Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 3, Eusebius in the Chronicle, Epiphanius in heresies 27, and Jerome in the essay on Clement in his book on illustrious men.

In addition, they all say that Cletus and Anacletus is one person; therefore nothing certain can be established, and so the disagreement among the authors is an argument for falsity.

I respond to the first point that the disagreement about the time when Peter arrived in Rome does not weaken our position that Peter came to Rome; for it often happens that there is certainty about some event, but there is no certainly about how it happened and other circumstances. For, it is certain among Christians that Christ died on the cross for us, but there is much disagreement about the exact time when he died. Tertullian in his book against the Jews, Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of his Stromata, and Lactantius in book 4, chapter 10 on the divine institutes teach that Christ died in the 15th year of Tiberius, when he was 30 years old. Ignatius to the Trallians, Eusebius in the Chronicle and others say that at the age of 33 he was crucified in the 15th year of Tiberius. Onuphrius Mercator and some other more recent authors say that Christ died in his 34th year. Irenaeus in book 2, chapter 39 contends that Christ was almost fifty years old, and therefore that he did not die under Tiberius, but under Claudius.

About the day and month when Christ died there is so much disagreement of the old and more recent authors that the debate is still undecided. On this see Clement in book 1 of the Stromata, where he presents many opinions; but on that account will we deny that Christ suffered?

Similarly, since it is certain that the weeks of Daniel were fulfilled in the passion of Christ, still there are several opinions about the time when they begin and when they end. The situation is the same concerning the years of the kings of Persia, the years of Samuel, of Saul, and of some of the other leaders of the Jews; concerning the years of the emperors and of the Roman pontiffs; finally, concerning the years of the earth, which have taken place until now, there almost as many opinions as there are chronologies. Therefore, on account of this shall we say that the kings of Persia did not exist, that

Samuel and Saul did not preside, that the emperors and pontiffs never existed, and that the world itself did not begin, or even continue until this day?

The disagreement of authors is an argument of falsity, according to that in which they disagree, because necessarily some of those disagreeing are in error. But just as disagreement is a sign of error, so the great harmony existing among the Fathers that Peter presided in Rome, and that he died there, is a sign of truth.

However, I respond that there is no disagreement among the good authors. For, Eusebius in the Chronicle, Jerome in his book on ecclesiastical writers in the essay on Peter, and Addo of Treves in the Martyrology say that Peter came to Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius; Orosius does not disagree with them, since he says that he came at the beginning of the reign of Claudius. For, if you divide the reign of Claudius into three parts, that is, the beginning, middle and end, you will see that the second year pertains to the beginning. All those authors agree with this, who say that Peter presided in Rome for 25 years, and that he died in the 14th year of Nero, namely, Damasus, Isidore, Bede, Freculpus, Ado of Vienne, and the others whom we cited above. And there are not 25 years until the 14th year of Nero, unless we begin counting from the second year of Claudius.

Wherefore we rightly reject the packet of letters of the times and the account of the lives of the saints, especially since that packet follows Marianus Scotus, who clearly contradicts himself and the truth. For, in his Chronicle Marianus Scotus says that Peter came to Rome in the 4th year of Claudius, and that he died in the last year of Nero, and still that he presided in the Roman episcopacy for 25 years and two months, and these numbers in no way agree with each other. For, the entire reign of Claudius was 13 years, 7 months, 29 days, according to the testimony of Dione Cassius, Suetonius Tranquillus, Eusebius, and Marianus Scotus himself. For, since in the Chronicle of Eusebius 14 years, 7 months, 28 days are attributed to Nero, it is clear that it was made by an error of the copyists, because afterwards, when the individual years are added up, there are found to be only 13 and some months.

Now these times of Claudius and Nero, taken together, do not give a larger sum than 27 years, 4 months, 18 days; and if you take from these 3 years, 5 months and 18 days, which Marianus Scotus says elapsed from the reign of Claudius before Peter arrived in Rome, then there are only 23 years and 11 months left. Therefore Peter died after Nero, or he did not preside for 25 years.

But what pertains to the other part of the argument, concerning the succession of the first four pontiffs, my first response is this: even if we do not know clearly who was the first to succeed Peter, still on that account there should not be any doubt that someone succeeded him. Just as there is a big question debated among the commentators about who the husband of Esther was, since some have written that it was Assuerus the Mede, others that it was Cambyses the Persian, others Darius Histaspis, others Artaxerxes Longimanus, and finally others say it was Mnemon, so no one ever had any doubt that Esther had a husband.

Next I respond that the whole matter can be settled and explained. The Apostle Peter, when his death was imminent, left the episcopal See to St. Clement. This is testified to

by serious authors, like Tertullian in his book on prescription, Jerome in book 1 against Jovinianus and in his comments on Isa. 52, Ruffinus in the preface of the Recognitions, Pope John III in a letter to the bishops of Germany, Clement himself in book 7, chapter 37 of the Apostolic Constitution, Anacletus in letter 1, Alexander in letter 1 and Damasus in the life of Peter.

Moreover, after the death of Peter, Clement did not want to accept the apostolic See, as long as Linus and Cletus lived, who had been the assistants to St. Peter in the episcopal office. Therefore the first pontiff after Peter was not Clement, but Linus. We gather that that was the situation from Epiphanius in his Heresies 27; he says, based on the history of the early Christians, that Clement refused to accept the See while Linus and Cletus were still alive. Then from this ambiguity there is this: if without any contention Clement had succeeded Peter, or Linus or anyone else, certainly there would be no question about the first successor of Peter. Concerning the first successor of James in Jerusalem, and of Mark in Alexandria, and of Peter himself in Antioch, there never was any question.

But because in the Roman Church, after the death of Peter, there arose a holy contention out of humility, and there was one, and the other had to be the first successor of Peter, because of that a certain obscurity was introduced into this succession. But from these details the authors can be brought into unity, who either place Clement before Linus, or Linus before Clement; since Irenaeus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Optatus, Augustine, Jerome, while they say that Linus was the immediate successor of Peter, are speaking the truth, but they do not deny that it happened that way because Clement refused to accept the episcopacy. Then Tertullian, Jerome, Ruffinus and others who write that Peter left Clement as his successor, are narrating what is true, but they do not deny that Clement at that time did not want to accept the See.

I am not very much impressed that the Pontifical book of Damasus, Sophronius and Simeon Metaphrastes in the life of Linus say that Linus died before Peter. For, Sophronius and Simeon are quite recent; but the Pontifical book, which is attributed to Damasus, in this matter has doubtful authority. But the authors, who write that Linus succeeded Peter are both veiy ancient and also numerous and reliable.

Now after Linus Cletus is to be placed, or Anacletus, after whom Clement is in the fourth place. The authors in favor of this listing are Irenaeus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome; also there is the ancient canon of the Mass, where we read Linus, Cletus, Clement; finally, there is Ignatius in the letter to Maria Zarben, where he says that Clement succeeded Anacletus. Without doubt another Anacletus is to be placed after Clement, as Optatus, Augustine, Damasus, and others say.

Thus there were two named Anacletus, of whom one was also called Cletus, although because of the similarity of the name many ancient authors made one out of the two. That there were two, the authority of the Catholic Church persuades us, because she celebrates two feast days in memory of them, namely, of Cletus in the month of April, and of Anacletus in the month of July. She says that Cletus was a Roman, and the son of Aemelianus, and that Anacletus was an Athenian, and the son of Antiochus. For it is not credible that the universal Church would err in such an important matter.

Then we gather the same thing from the fact that some of the ancient authors place

Anacletus before Clement, like Ignatius, Irenaeus, Eusebius; others place him after Clement, like Optatus, Damasus, Augustine; now this is an argument that there were two, not one. In addition, that the first Anacletus also often is called Cletus, is certain from the fact that the very same pontiff, whom Ignatius, Irenaeus and Eusebius call Anacletus- Epiphanius, Jerome, Damasus, John III, and the holy canon of the Mass call Cletus.

But it should not seem surprising, because of the similarity of the name, that out of two named Anacletus some of the ancient authors made one man; and it is certain that among the Greeks passim Novatus is confused with Novatian, and it is certain that Novatus of Carthage was Novatian, a Roman priest. Also Eusebius and Nicephorus of Constantinople, in their Chronicles, made one man out of Marcellus and Marcellinus, while it is absolutely certain and established that they were two men.

CHAPTER VI

THE SECOND ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The second persuasion of Velenus, which is also that of Calvin and the Magdeburgenses, is that Peter could not have come to Rome before 18 years after the death of the Lord. For, when the Council of Jerusalem took place (see Acts 15), Peter was still in Judea; but that Council took place in the 18th year after the passion of the Lord, as St. Jerome says in his comments on Gal. 2. For, Paul three years after his conversion came to Jerusalem to see Peter (see Gal. 1). Then after 14 years he returned to Jerusalem for the Council as reported in Gal. 2; and if you add to this the one year that transpired from the passion of the Lord to the conversion of Paul there are 18 years.

You can add to this that Peter is said to have been five years in Judea, then seven years in Antioch, then many other years in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia; and he could not have preached for one day in so many places. Therefore, at a minimum, there was a passing of 18 years before Peter could have come to Rome.

Furthermore, if Peter came to Rome before the 18th year, certainly he would have come in the second year of Claudius, as we said above, and that cannot be the case; both because in that year St. Peter had not yet been freed from his chains, with which Herod had confined him, for that liberation happened in the third year of Claudius, as is gathered from Luke in Acts 12:3ff. and from Josephus in book 19, chapter 7 in his Antiquities, and also because Christ had commanded the Apostles twelve years before not to leave Jerusalem, as Eusebius recounts about the martyr Thraseas in book 5, chapter 18 of his History; but the twelfth year from the resurrection of the Lord coincides with the third year of Claudius. Therefore Peter did not come to Rome in the second year of Claudius, but after the ninth year, which was 18 years from the passion of the Lord.

However, Peter is said to have presided in Rome for 25 years by Damasus, Eusebius, Jerome and others; therefore he survived until the 43rd year after the passion of the Lord. But then Nero had already died, indeed also Galba, Otto and Vitellius, and Vespasian was the emperor; therefore Peter died during the time of Vespasian, but Vespasian was a very mild emperor, and he did not kill any Christians in Rome, as all authors bear witness. See Tertullian in chapter 5 of his Apology, Augustine in book 3, chapter 31 in *The City of God;* Eusebius, Sulpitius, Orosius, and all the other historians; therefore Peter died someplace other than Rome.

I respond first of all: even if the Fathers erred, who said that the Apostle Peter ruled in Rome for 25 years, still it would not follow, on account of that, that Peter never presided in Rome, as we demonstrated above with many similar quotes. But it is not necessary to resort to them, for truly he resided for 25 years in Rome and for seven in Antioch, and all these dates agree. For this is the true and brief history of the life of St. Peter.

St. Peter remained for about five years in Judea; therefore, St. Paul, three years after his conversion, could easily have met Peter in Jerusalem. And Eusebius rightly places Peter's going to the city of Antioch in the fifth year after the death of the Lord. And the tradition of the martyr Thraseas does not contradict this; for, the Lord did not order

that all twelve of the Apostles should remain in Jerusalem. It is certain that this claim is false from the Acts of the Apostles in chapters 8, 9 and 10, where we read about Peter's travelling to Samaria, Lydda, Joppa and Caesarea, before he was put in chains, and so this was before the 12th year from the passion of Christ. All did not leave Jerusalem, but some disciples or also some of the Apostles always remained there as witnesses for the Hebrews. Therefore Peter left Judea for Syria in the fifth year after the passion of the Lord, established the See at Antioch, and remained there for about seven years as the bishop of that city.

However, this is not to be understood in the sense that he never left Antioch during that whole time; actually, during the same time he travelled to the neighboring provinces—Pontus, Asia, Galatia, Cappadocia and Bithynia. In the seventh year of his episcopacy in Antioch, he departed from there, which was the 11th year after the passion of the Lord, and returned to Jerusalem. There he was arrested by Herod and was put in chains in the days of the Unleavened Bread according to Acts 12, but shortly thereafter, having been freed by an angel, in the same year, which was the second year of Claudius, he went to Rome, and there he established his See and held on to it for 25 years.

However, during the whole time he was the Roman bishop he did not remain in Rome, but after he had preached for seven year in Rome he returned to Jerusalem, having been expelled from Rome together with the other Jews by Claudius. For, Luke writes in Acts 18 that Claudius expelled all the Jews from the city. Suetonius writes the same thing in the history of Claudius; Josephus says the same, as Orosius quotes him, and Paul Orosius himself in book 7 of his History; they also add that this happened in Claudius's ninth year, that is, 18 years after the passion of the Lord. Therefore, when those who were in Antioch heard that Peter had come to Jerusalem, they sent Paul and Barnabas to him, and then the Council of Jerusalem took place. But when Claudius died, Peter returned to Rome and there he ended his life.

But there is no contradiction to this in the fact that Peter was in chains in Jerusalem shortly after the death of Herod, as is gathered from Acts 12, since from Josephus in book 12, chapter 7 in his Antiquities it is certain that Herod died in the third year of Claudius. For, St. Luke in Acts 12 does not say that Peter was in chains shortly before the death of Herod, but rather he indicates the contrary, when he narrates that, after Peter was freed from the chains, Herod went to Caesarea and dwelt there. But that stay, however long it was, means that he was there for at least one year. And Luke says that, after the murder of James and the chaining of Peter, almost immediately the death of Herod took place, in order to indicate that the horrible death of Herod was a punishment for the sin committed by him against the Apostles of the Lord.

Against this history, which we have just explained, a new opinion of Onuphrius Panuinus is very strongly opposed. Now I will proceed to refute this opinion with a brief rebuttal. Therefore, Panuinus in his remarks to Platinas, at the very beginning says that St. Peter was not the bishop of Antioch before he went to Rome, but only after he had returned from Rome, and was present at the Council of Jerusalem. This opinion is refuted by many strong arguments. First, it openly conflicts with the position of the sovereign pontiffs, of the ancient Fathers, and of renowned historians. The ancient and

holy pontiffs, Anacletus in letter 3, Marcellus in letter 1, Damasus in the lives of the pontiffs, Innocent in letter 14, Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles, Gelasius on the apocryphal books, Pelagius junior in the letter to Benignus, Gregory in book 7, letter 37 with clear words testify that Peter presided in Antioch before he went to Rome. The same point is written down by Eusebius in the Chronicle, Jerome in his book on ecclesiastical writers in the essay on Peter and also in his commentary on Gal. 2, Isidore in his book on the lives of the Fathers, Bede on the six ages, Ado of Vienne in the Chronicle, Simeon Metaphrastes in the life of St. Peter, Haymo in book 2, chapter 2 Ion the memory of Christian things, and many others, both old and more recent. And there is no one that I know about, among the ancient authors, who wrote anything contrary to this, and there have been no recent authors either with the exception of Onuphrius. And he cannot respond that these authors must be understood to be speaking about the later arrival of Peter in Rome, that is, when Nero was emperor, but not before under Claudius. For, many of these authors also record the time, and say that Peter came to Rome under Claudius, since he had already founded the Church in Antioch, as Damasus, Eusebius, Jerome, Leo, Bede, Isidore, Haymo, Ado say. The others cited by us do not give the time, however they plainly say that St. Peter was the first bishop of Antioch, then of Rome, and Onuphrius contradicts this. Therefore, there is no doubt but that the opinion of Onuphrius is new, and lacks the support of suitable authors.

Next, this opinion is opposed to the ecclesiastical tradition on the feast day instituted in honor of the chair of Antioch. For, the solemnity of the chair of Antioch is very old, as is clear from the sermons of St. Augustine on the chair of Peter, and also from the martyrologies of Bede, Usuardus and Ado of Treves. It is celebrated by the whole Christian world, and actually with more honor than the feast day of the chair of Rome, which was instituted recently by Paul IV, and it is celebrated nowhere by the people as a feast day, since the feast day of the chair of Antioch is religiously observed not only by the clergy, but also by the people in many places. But certainly if the chair of Antioch came after the chair of Rome, as Panuinus contends, there would be no reason why the western Church would celebrate a feast day for the institution of the chair of Antioch, rather than that of Alexandria, or Jerusalem; or at least why that solemnity would be older and more honored than the chair of Rome. Therefore it must be conceded that the first chair of St. Peter was in Antioch, and so throughout the whole Church a feast day is celebrated in it honor.

Thirdly, that opinion conflicts with plain reason. For, if St. Peter did not preside in Antioch until after the Council of Jerusalem, that is, 18 years after the passion of the Lord, then I ask: Before this time was someone the bishop of Antioch, or was no one? In no way is it credible that there was no bishop there, since there were many Christians in Antioch almost immediately after the passion of the Lord; in fact, it was also a flourishing Church—so much so that there for the first time the disciples began to be called Christians, as is known from Acts 11:26. Now if someone was bishop of Antioch, I ask: Was it Peter or someone else? If it was Peter, that is what we contend; if it was someone else, many absurd consequences follow, for it will not be true what all historians say, and what Ignatius says in his letter to Antioch, namely, that the first bishop

of Antioch was Peter, then Evodius, then Ignatius. Likewise it would have to be conceded that the Apostle Peter succeeded in the episcopacy of Antioch one of the disciples, which is clearly unacceptable. Furthermore, if Peter came to Antioch, and there received the episcopal See, since he had already occupied the episcopal chair in Rome for some years, then I ask: Did Peter renounce the Roman episcopate, or did he keep it? If he renounced it, then he renounced the chair which he had assumed at the command of God; therefore he was not in Rome for twenty-five years, or even a full twenty years, which is contraiy to what all the authors say. If he did not renounce it, then he had at the same time two individual episcopacies, very far removed from each other. Therefore he left to posterity the pernicious example of having several episcopacies at the same time. Perhaps you will say: St. Peter came to Antioch from Rome, but did not preside in Antioch as the real bishop of that city. But many absurd conclusions follow also from this; for, if St. Peter was not the bishop of Antioch, the See of Antioch would not be patriarchal; the feast day of the chair of Antioch would not have been instituted; all historians would be in error, who say that the Apostle Peter was the first bishop of Antioch.

But let us see now what drove Onuphrius to invent his new opinion. His first argument is taken from the authority of St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, from St. Paul in his letter to the Galatians, and from Eusebius in the Chronicle. For, he says that he concludes from these authorities that St. Peter did not depart from Judea during the first nine years after the passion of the Lord. But he says that Peter went to Rome in the tenth year, from which it follows that he could not preside in Antioch until after his return from the city.

I respond that none of these points can be drawn from the cited authors. For, from the Acts of the Apostles and from Galatians we have only that St. Peter was in Jerusalem in the 4th, the 11th and the 18th year after the passion. Concerning year 4, it is certain from the letter to the Galatians, for there Paul says that he came to Jerusalem to see Peter three years after his conversion, that is, the 4th year after the passion of the Lord; this agrees with what St. Luke narrates about Cornelius, Aeneas, Tabitha, Simon Magus, and others. Concerning the 11th year, this is certain from Acts 12, because the chains of St. Peter and the death of St. James occurred in the second year of Claudius, as Onuphrius admits, and this can be proved from Josephus. A little bit later I will prove that the second year of Claudius was the eleventh after the passion of the Lord. Concerning the 18th year, this is clear from chapter 2 of Galatians. These points are certain from the Scriptures, but from these it cannot be deduced that Peter could not have been in Antioch from the fourth year after the passion of the Lord until the eleventh year. In addition, what Onuphrius says, that he concludes from the Chronicle of Eusebius that St. Peter could not have occupied the chair in Antioch before he went to Rome, is amazing: for, in that Chronicle Eusebius with clear words says that, when Tiberius was emperor, St. Peter established his chair in Antioch, and that he occupied it for seven years, and then finally went to Rome in the second year of Claudius. There is of course an error in the Chronicle of Eusebius concerning the time of St. Peter's chains, but that has nothing to do with the present question.

Another argument of Onuphrius is a certain historical demonstration, which he gives briefly in his notes to Platinas, but he explains it more at length in Com. Fastor. Here is

his demonstration. Christ suffered in the 19th year of Tiberius, at the age of 34. But Peter went to Rome in the 2nd year of Claudius; from the 19th year of Tiberius to the 2nd year of Claudius there are almost ten full years, as has been noted.

Of these ten years, Peter spent the first four in Judea, as was proved above from the letter to the Galatians; therefore there remain almost six full years, and therefore there is no place for a seven year stay in Antioch. Then, that Christ died in the 19th year of Tiberius, at the age of 34, Onuphrius proves first of all from the Olympiads. For, it is certain from Phlegon that in the fourth year of the 202nd Olympiad that the extraordinary eclipse took place, which took place when Christ was dying; but the fourth year of Olympiad 202 occurred in the 34th year of Christ. Then he proves from Bede, who writes it in chapter 45 in his book on time, that the faith of the Church holds that Christ lived in his mortal flesh a little more than thirty-three years.

I respond. This demonstration, if it proves anything, proves only that St. Peter did not spend the full seven years at Antioch, but only six or five. But it does not prove that Peter was not the bishop of Antioch before he went to Rome. Then, his reasoning does not even prove this. For, St. Peter in the second year after the passion of the Lord could have established his chair at Antioch, and occupied it for seven full years, but in such a way that often he returned to Jerusalem, and also travelled to other places. But it is not necessaiy to resort to that; for, Onuphrius does not really prove that Christ suffered in the 19th year of Tiberius, at the age of 34; for, the argument he draws from the Olympiads is refuted easily. Since the most important question is when the Olympiads begin, and just as Onuphrius, according to his opinion, so arranged them that the 34th year of the Lord coincides exactly with Olympiad 204, so also others arrange the Olympiads in such a way that the 33rd year of the Lord coincides with the same Olympiad.

However, the argument taken from the testimony of Bede completely demolishes the opinion of Onuphrius. Indeed since Bede says that, according to the faith of the Church, Christ lived a little more than thirty-three years, he is speaking about years begun, not completed, so that the meaning is that Christ arrived at the age of 33, and lived a little bit longer than that; this is something that is clearly proved. For, in the same place, Bede proves his opinion from some catalogues of the Roman Church, in which the year of the passion of the Lord was noted, having subtracted thirty-three years which transpired from the Incarnation to the passion. From this we understand, according to the faith of the Roman Church, that there were precisely thirty-three years from the Incarnation to the passion, because according to the thinking of the Elders Christ was conceived and died on March 25. But if from the Incarnation to the passion there are clearly 33 years, certainly from the nativity to the passion there are thirty-three years not completed.

Therefore Onuphrius has not proved his opinion. But we can prove the contrary opinion, which we think is the true one, with two arguments. The first argument is based on three principles, one of which is that Christ in the opinion of Eusebius in the Chronicle, of Paul Orosius in book 7, chapter 2, and of almost all others was bom in the year 42 of the reign of Caesar Augustus. The second principle is that Augustus ruled for almost 56 years, as Suetonius and others record. The third is that Christ suffered in the 18th year of Tiberius, which Eusebius says explicitly in the Chronicle, Epiphanius in the book on

measures and weights, Eutropius in book 7 and Bede in the ages, and it is also gathered from Jerome in the essay on Paul in his book on ecclesiastical authors, where he says that the 2nd year of Nero was 25 years after the passion of the Lord. For, even if we give Tiberius four whole years after the passion of Christ, Caius four whole years, Claudius 14 whole years, and if we accept the second complete year of Nero, we would still not have 25 years, but only 24. Therefore it is necessary from the opinion of St. Jerome to give Tiberius five years after the passion of the Lord, and according to this, to date the passion of the Lord in the 18th year of Tiberius, not in the 19th as Onuphrius contends. From these three principles it is clearly concluded that Christ suffered in his 33rd year, not the 34th, for from the 42nd year of Augustus to the 18th year of Tiberius there are not more than 33. Not even Onuphrius can deny this, if he admits that Christ suffered in the 18th year of Tiberius.

Our second argument is based on two other very certain principles. One is that Christ was baptized at the beginning of his 30th year and before its completion. The second is that after his baptism Christ lived for three years, and a little bit more. Now the first principle is proved from the testimony of Luke 3:23, *and Jesus was beginning his thirtieth year of age.* For, unless violence is used against these words, the plain and obvious meaning is that Christ was at the beginning of his thirtieth year when he came for baptism; for, he was thirty years of age, that is, not having complete them but beginning his thirtieth year. All the old Fathers understood the words in this way, and in the explanation of the Scriptures it is imprudent to depart from their harmonious agreement. St. Irenaeus in book 2, chapter 39 said: *He came for baptism when he had not yet completed thirty years but he had just begun his thirtieth year; for this is what Luke said when he mentioned his age.* Tertullian in his book against the Jews, Clement of Alexandria in book 1 of the Stromata, and Julius Africanus in Jerome's Commentary on Daniel 9 write that Christ preached one year, and afterwards was killed, when he had completed his thirtieth year. From this it follows necessarily that they want him to be baptized at the beginning of his thirtieth year; and although they err when they say that Christ died at the end of his 30th year, since they write that without any foundation, still they do not err when they write that he was baptized at the beginning of his 30th year, because they are following the Evangelist Luke, as he is generally explained. Eusebius in book 1, chapter 10 of his Histoiy, according to the version of Christophorsonus said: when he had already begun his thirtieth year he went to John to be imbued with the washing of baptism. Epiphanius in Heresies 51 said: *He was thirty years old, and no more; for this reason he says, he was beginning about his thirtieth year.* And after that he adds: *Christ had completed his thirtieth year, when he performed his first sign in Cana of Galilee.* Gregoiy Nazianze in his Oration on the Baptist, Jerome on Ezek. 1, Chrysostom in homily 14 on Mark and Gregory in homily 2 on Ezekiel say that Christ began to teach, after being baptized in the age of 30. This way of speaking indicates the beginning of the thirtieth year, not the completion of it. Augustine more clearly in chapter 28 of his book on Christian Doctrix writes that Christ, when he was about 30 years old, came for baptism. Isidore in book' chapter 27 said: Because of this, being no more than thirty years old, he came for baptist for he says, *and Jesus was beginning his thirtieth year.* Finally, there is canon 11 of th

ancient Council of Neo-Caesarea, where priests are forbidden to be ordained before their thirtieth year, because Christ was baptized at age 30 and began to preach. This canon was understood to be about the beginning of the thirtieth year, not its completion, as it was explained by Martin Braccarensis in canon 20 of the collection of Greek canons. St. Jerome teaches this quite clearly in the letter to Theophylus against John of Jerusalem, where he proves that his brother was ordained at the legitimate age, because he had already arrived at the age of thirty. The custom of the Church also teaches this, and when it reduced the age from thirty to twenty-five, then it judged that a man was fit for the priesthood, when he attained the age of twenty-five.

St. Ignatius is not opposed to this; for in his letter to the Trallians he writes that Christ was baptized when he had completed three decades of years; nor does St. John Chrysostom, who in homily 10 on Matthew writes that Christ came for baptism after thirty years. For, St. Ignatius is speaking about three completed decades of years, because he had arrived at the last year of the third decade, not because he had arrived at the end of the thirtieth year. For thus we understand the expression in Luke 2:21—at the end of eight days when the boy was to be circumcised—that is, when it came to the eighth day in which the boy should be circumcised, and in Acts 2:1—when the day of Pentecost had come—that is, when it came to the fiftieth day, but not when the fiftieth day had been completed. Or he is using a figure of understanding, which the sacred writers were also familiar with. For as St. Luke writes in 2:21, "at the end of eight days, when the Lord was circumcised," he does not mean that the eight days were completed, but that they were near completion, since it took place on the eighth day. As Mark writes in chapter 8:31 that Christ would resurrect after three days, because he was going to resurrect on the third day, so also St. Ignatius writes that Christ, at the time of his baptism, had completed three decades of years, because he was so little removed from the end of the three decades, that he was already living in the last year of the third decade.

The quote from Chiysostom will be explained still more easily. For, at the beginning of the homily he writes that John came to baptize after about 30 years, from which it follows that John, at that time, had not completed his thirtieth year. But if John had not completed his thirtieth year, by how much less had Christ completed his thirtieth year, who was six months younger than John? Therefore when Chrysostom says that Christ after thirty years came for baptism, doubtless he means that that he came after the beginning of his thirtieth year, not at its completion. Therefore let it be established from the general opinion that Christ was baptized at the beginning of his thirtieth year.

The second principle was that Christ, after his baptism, preached more than three years, and accordingly suffered at the beginning of his 33rd year, and this principle is clearly gathered from John's Gospel. For, we have four Passovers recorded in John's Gospel—one in John 2:13, the second in John 4:45, the third in John 6:4, the fourth in John 13:1. Therefore, since Christ after his baptism celebrated four Passovers, it is necessary that he arrived at the fourth year of teaching. St. Ignatius in his letter to the Trallians clearly says that Christ preached for three years; but this certainly is not true, since it is certain that he began to preach 40 days after his baptism, and that he preached until his passion, which is a time of three years, and somewhat more, as we have showed

from the number of Passovers. But as Ignatius, when he says that Christ was baptized when he had completed three decades of years, omits the minutiae which were lacking from completing the three decades, so also when he says that he preached for three years he omitted the minutiae of the times that were remaining. Eusebius in book 8, number 2, of his evangelical demonstration and Bede in chapter 45 of his book on the nature of time say that Christ preached for three years and a half; but this is not exactly true, but they also were not concerned about the minutiae of the times, and perhaps counted the years from the baptism to the Ascension. For, in that way there are almost three and a half years. Moreover, there is not one of the ancients who attributes four full years to the preaching of Christ. But that is enough about this matter.

CHAPTER VII

ANOTHER FIVE ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

The third persuasion is this. Peter could not come to Rome until the 9th year of Claudius, as was proved above, and he also could not have come after that. For, Claudius, who ordered the Jews to be expelled from the city, without doubt also ordered them not be received in the city; therefore he never came.

But we have already shown that Peter in the 9th year of Claudius did not come to Rome, but had left Rome, and returned later during the time of Nero; but that under Nero the Jews could be in Rome is clear from Acts 28, where Paul is preaching to the Jews in Rome.

The fourth persuasion. When Paul reprimanded Peter at Antioch (Gal. 2:11) the Council of Jerusalem had been concluded, but Peter had still not gone to Rome. I respond: he had gone and then returned.

The fifth persuasion. Paul, when writing to the Romans, in chapter 16 orders many to be greeted. But he makes no mention of Peter. And this is the persuasion not only for Velenus, but also proof for Illyricus that Peter never was in Rome.

I respond first of all that this argument concludes to nothing, since otherwise it would follow that John was not the bishop of Ephesus, and that James was not the bishop of Jerusalem, because Paul writing to the Ephesians and to the Hebrews does not mention John and James. Secondly, I say that Paul did not order Peter to be greeted, because he wrote his letter at a time during which Peter had returned from Rome, and was active in Syria. For, Paul wrote the letter while he was travelling to Jerusalem, where he was arrested. Thus he himself says in Rom. 15:25-26: *At present, however, I am going to Jerusalem with aid for the saints. For Macedonia and Achaia have been pleased to make some contribution for the poor among the saints at Jerusalem.* And in Acts 24:17 the same Paul, when he brought his case before the tribunal of Felix, governor or Syria, said: *I came to bring to my nation alms and offerings.*

In addition this imprisonment of Paul happened in the middle time between the Council of Jerusalem and the death of Claudius. Now after that Council, Paul went to Macedonia and Achaia, where he had never been before, as is clear from Acts 16:10. But he arrived in Jerusalem when Felix was governor, and he ruled in Syria until the death of Claudius and the beginning of Nero, as Josephus says in book 20, chapters 9 and 13 in his Antiquities. From this it follows that the letter to the Romans was written about the 11th or 12th year of Claudius, at which time St. Peter had returned from Rome and was again travelling through and visiting the regions of Syria. So why is it surprising if Paul, when writing to the Romans, does not greet Peter, since it is certain that then he was not in Rome?

The sixth persuasion. Ambrose in comments on Rom. 16 says that Narcissus, whom Paul orders to be greeted, was a Roman priest. But priest and bishop are the same in Paul. Therefore that Narcissus was the Roman bishop; hence Peter was not the first bishop of the Romans.

I respond that Narcissus perhaps was a Roman priest, but without doubt he was not the bishop. Indeed Irenaeus, Eusebius, Optatus, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine and others, who have written down the catalogue of the Roman bishops, made no mention of this Narcissus. The authority of Ambrose is not opposed to this, because Ambrose said in reference to 1 Tim. 3: *Every bishop is a priest, but not every priest is a bishop.* And Cornelius in book 6, chapter 33 of Eusebius's History says that in Rome there was one bishop and forty-six priests.

Persuasion seven. Paul had an agreement with Peter that he should be the Apostle of the Gentiles and Peter the Apostle of the Jews (see Gal. 2). Therefore how probable is it that Peter would ignore that agreement so quickly and travel to another province, that is, to go to Rome, which was the mother of all Gentiles?

If you say: Peter in Rome preached to the Jews who were there, it seems not to be true. For, when Paul arrived and began to preach they were astonished at the newness of his teaching, as can be known from the words of the Jews in Acts 28:22: *We desire to hear from you what your views are; for with regard to this sect we know that everywhere it is spoken against.* And after that: *Some were convinced by what he said, while others disbelieved. So, as they disagreed among themselves, they departed.*

I respond that the agreement between Peter and Paul was not that Peter would preach only to Jews, or only in Judea; that Paul would preach only to the Gentiles, and only outside Judea, but that Peter would preach to all, and wherever he wished, but principally to the Jews; Paul would preach to all, and wherever he wished, but principally to the Gentiles. Otherwise Paul would be said to have invaded a foreign province, when coming to Rome he immediately began to preach to the Jews, as is clear from Acts 28, and Peter not only should not have come to Rome, but also not to Antioch, or to Asia, Galatia, Pontus, Cappadocia, Bythinia; and Velenus says that he went to all these places.

However, what Velenus says is false, namely, that the Jews in Rome were astonished at the newness of the teaching, when Paul preached Christ to them, as if no one previously had preached such things. For, if at Rome no one had preached to the Jews before Paul arrived there, then who converted those Roman Jews to whom he wrote the letter? For it is certain that the letter was written partly for Gentiles and partly for the Jews who had been converted to faith in Christ. Therefore in the first four chapters he is arguing about justification from faith without the works of the law against the pride of the Jews, who attributed the coming of the Messiah to their own merits. And in chapter 14 is he dealing with those who were still acting as Jews by abstaining from certain unclean foods according to the law? And in chapter 16 he greets many persons who certainly were Jewish Christians.

Perhaps someone will say: if the letter to the Romans was written while Claudius was living, who had expelled the Jews from the city, who are those Jews in Rome whom Paul wishes to be greeted? For it is not credible that, while Claudius was living, Jews could return to the city.

I respond that it is not only credible that Jews could return shortly after the expulsion, but there is no doubt that they did return. For, in Acts 18:2 Paul finds the Jews Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth; they recently came from Rome, having been driven out by Claudius.

Then when he had remained in Achaia for a year and six months, and in Asia for two years (Acts 18 and 19), he travelled to Jerusalem, and on that journey he wrote to the Romans, and he greeted Aquila and Priscilla, who had already returned to Rome.

But to those words of the Jews, *We desire to hear from you what your views are, etc.,* I say: those words are not those of all the Jews in Rome, but only of those who had not yet been converted to the faith of Christ; in addition to them there were many others living in Rome whom Peter had converted. Also with those words it is not signified that they had never heard preaching about Christ, but that they still were not persuaded. And so they wanted to listen to Paul, and when they had heard his speak effectively, part of them were persuaded to believe, and part of them remained obstinate.

CHAPTER VIII

ANOTHER EIGHT ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

Persuasions 8 to 15 are taken from the last chapter of the Acts of the Apostles and from the letters that Paul wrote from Rome, namely, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, Philippians, Hebrews, 1 and 2 Timothy and Philemon, and from the letters of Paul to Seneca, and of Seneca to Paul. For, in all these writings there was an occasion to speak about Peter, if he was in Rome; but an amazing silence is found everywhere.

Then there is the fact that not only in these places Peter is not said to be in Rome, but also it is plainly indicated that he was not there. For in Phil. 2:21 he says about those who were in Rome: *They all look after their own interests,* And in Col .4:10: *Aristarchus,* he said, *my fellow prisoner greets you, and Mark the cousin of Barnabas,., and Jesus who is called Justus. These are the only men among my fellow workers for the kingdom of God.* And in 2 Tim. 4:16: *At my first defense no one took my part; all deserted me.* Therefore either Peter was not in Rome, or Paul is doing him a great injury, since he numbers him among those who were looking after their own interests, and who were not among his fellow workers for the kingdom of God, and who deserted him in his distress. This is the argument not only of Velenus, but also of Calvin.

I respond first of all that nothing is concluded by arguments from the authority of a negative. For, this does not follow: Luke, Paul and Seneca do not say that Peter was in Rome, therefore Peter was not in Rome. For those three did not have to say everything, and more credence is given to three witnesses affirming something, than to a thousand who say nothing, provided that they do not deny what the others affirm. Otherwise, because Matthew does not write in his Gospel that Christ was circumcised, Mark does not mention the presentation, Luke does not mention the new star, John does not say that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary—then all those things are false, which is absolutely absurd.

But to those three places I say that it is not denied in them that Peter then was in Rome; for, when he says in Col. 4, *These are the only ones among my fellow workers for the kingdom of God,* he is speaking only about his own domestics, who were accustomed to serve him. As also in 2 Tim. 4:11 when he says, *Luke alone is with me,* he is speaking about the domestics and people helping him. For it is certain from Rom. 16 that there were many others, both Jews and Gentiles converted to the faith, who were promoting the kingdom of God. And in Phil. 2:21 when he says, *They all look after their own interests,* he is using a figure a speech that refers only to some, not to absolutely all. For in the same place he had said shortly before that Timothy was with him, who certainly was not looking after his own interests; and in chapter 1:16 he had said that some are preaching the Gospel *out of love,* and so they were not seeking their own interests but those of Christ.

Finally, in 2 Tim. 4:16 where he says, *No one took my part, but all deserted me. i* text that Calvin urges before others, he is speaking only about those who could help him with Caesar. For in the same place he says that at the time Luke was with him, and still he

says in a general way. *No one took my part, but all deserted me.* But it is certain that Peter could not have helped him, for he was opposed by Caesar no less than Paul. Therefore he is speaking about certain noble Romans, who could have approached Caesar on his behalf, but out of fear of the tyrant did not do it

Secondly, this response could be made: at the time when Paul arrived in Rome, and when he wrote those letters Peter was not in Rome. For although he had established his chair in Rome, nevertheless often he was absent since it was necessary for him to be in various places of the Church, as Epiphanius says in Heresies 27. So because of that, Peter appointed two assistants for himself, Linus and Cletus, who in his absence took care of the episcopal duties of Rome.

CHAPTER IX

THE SIXTEENTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The sixteenth persuasion. Ambrose in sermon 67 says about Peter and Paul: *On one day, in one place, they endured the sentence of one tyrant.* But Linus in the passion of Peter and Paul says that they did not suffer at the same time, nor in the same place, nor at the command of the same tyrant.

Moreover, Josephus, who lived during the time of Nero, wrote in Rome the history of the Jewish War, and in it he mentions those killed by Nero. But he does not mention Peter, whom certainly he would not have omitted, if he really had been killed by Nero. For, Josephus was a friend of Christians, and often mentioned them, given the suitable occasion. Thus he writes about the death of Christ in book 18 of the Antiquities, and of the death of John the Baptist in the same place, and of James in book 20.

Add to this that Peter was an old man, when Paul was a youth; for, after the passion Paul is called a young man in Acts 7:58; at that time Peter already had a wife and as the oldest he was considered to be the first of all the Apostles. However, Paul also arrived at his old age, as he writes in his letter to Philemon; therefore it is not probable that they died at the same time.

But this argument can be easily refuted. For, in the first part of the argument Velenus errs twice. First, because he says that the history of Linus was fabricated, as is true, and still he says that by it the opinion of Ambrose is refuted. For if the history of Linus is fabricated, it has no authority; if it has no authority, how can the opinion of Ambrose, a reliable author, be refuted by it? Secondly, he errs because by "the same place" in Ambrose he understands the same part of the city, and hence he wants Ambrose to disagree with others, who say that the Apostles were killed in different parts of the same city. But when Ambrose says "the same part of the city," he then adds this: *In the same place, so that Rome does not lack the other one.*

Regarding the statement of Josephus, I say first of all that Josephus himself in book 2, chapter 11 of the Jewish War gives the answer. For, there he says that he wanted to pass over in silence the crimes of Nero—that he had killed his mother and his wife, and similar persons, since he knew that such narration is annoying. And he said this rightly, because he dedicated those books to the Roman Emperors, who do not willingly want to hear their predecessors vituperated. Secondly, this argument can be turned back against the author, for, in the same place Velenus says that Peter was killed at Jerusalem, at the command of Ananias, the high priest of the Jews. Therefore I ask: Why did Josephus, who in book 20 of the Antiquities writes about the deeds of that Ananias and which men he killed, not mention Peter is that place? Thus Velenus cuts his throat with his own sword.

Concerning his age I say that Peter was not an old man, when Paul was a young man, but a man of mature age. For, that he had a wife, and was the leader of the Apostles, is an argument for a mature age. And it is not in any way credible that old men were chosen by Christ to endure the greatest labors, and to travel throughout almost the whole world. In the same way it is not credible that Paul as a youth was raised to the apostolic dignity, to

whom the care of all the Churches pertained.

Therefore we submit that Peter was about fifty years of age, when Paul was about 25, that is, twice his age. Nevertheless both could still be old men and die together; for, in the last year of Nero Peter would have been about 86 and Paul about 61.

CHAPTER X

THE SEVENTEENTH ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

Persuasion 17. Scripture and the Fathers openly teach that Peter and Paul were killed in Jerusalem, not in Rome, by the scribes and Pharisees, not by the Roman Emperors. For. In Matt. 23:34 the Lord says: *Behold, I send you prophets and wise men and scribes, some of whom you will kill and crucify, and some you will scourge in your synagogues.* On this text Chiysostom said: *He means the apostles and those who were with them.* And Jerome said in reference to this same place: *Observe, according to the apostle, the various gifts of the disciples of Christ, some are prophets who predict the future, others are wise men who know when they should speak, others are scribes learned in the law—by whom Stephen was stoned to death, Paul was killed, Peter was crucified.* Likewise, Nicolaus Lyranus said about this place: *Of them you will kill, like James the brother of John* (Acts 12:2), *both Stephen* (Acts 7:58) *and many others, and you will crucify them, like Peter, and Andrew his brother, etc.*

I respond that from the words of the Lord in Matt. 23 and from the explanation of Chiysostom nothing can be concluded against our position. For, the Lord and Chiysostom do not say that all the Apostles are to be killed by the Jews in Jerusalem, but only some. That is what this sentence means: *Some of them you will kill and crucify, etc.,* and it was carried out in Stephen, whom they stoned (Acts 7), and against James, whom Herod killed to please the Jews (Acts 12), and against James the Less, whom the Jews themselves killed in Jerusalem, according to Josephus in book 20, chapter 16 of his Antiquities; then they killed Simeon the successor of James, who was crucified in Jerusalem, as Eusebius says in the Chronicle, and many think it probable that Mathias also was crucified in Judea.

But if Velenus contends that the Lord is speaking about all the Apostles, then all the histories will have to be denied, which testify that Andrew died in Achaia, Philip and John in Asia, Thomas in India, Bartholomew in Armenia, Matthew in Ethiopia, Simon and Jude in Persia.

But St. Jerome did not want to say that Peter and Paul were killed in Jerusalem, since he teaches clearly in his book on illustrious men that they were killed in Rome by Nero. But he deduces from the words of the Lord that there would be various gifts and different deaths for the disciples of Christ. Because the Lord said that he would send prophets, wise men and scribes, Jerome says that there are various gifts of the disciples. Again, because the Lord says: Some you will kill, some you will crucify, Jerome points out that the disciples will depart from this life in different ways, and he gives the examples of Stephen stoned, of Paul beheaded, of Peter crucified. Therefore these examples are not meant to make us understand which of the disciples the Jews were going to kill, but only to know that there would be in the future different kinds of martyrdoms.

In addition, Nicolaus Lyranus is not an author of such authority, that he should be opposed to all the ancient Fathers and historians, who hand on to us that Peter was killed in Rome by Nero, and Andrew in Achaia by Egaeas. Then there is the fact that Lyranus is following Jerome, and he wanted to say only that Peter and Andrew were crucified because of Christ, although he did say this in an unclear way.

CHAPTER XI

THE LAST ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

The last persuasion of Velenus goes like this. Since concerning recent events often errors get attached to them, Velenus said: concerning such remote and disturbed times, what could the flatterers of the Roman Curia not invent concerning the coming of Peter to Rome, his suffering and his pontificate?

But if Irenaeus, Tertullian, Eusebius, and the other 30 or 40 Fathers cited, were flatterers of the Roman Curia, then Velenus is speaking correctly. But if part of them are ancient, like Irenaeus and Tertullian, in whose time the Roman Church was not wealthy, so that it could have flatterers; if part are Greeks, like Eusebius, Theodoretus, Sozomenus, and others, whose nation was wont rather to resent the Roman Church than to flatter it; but if part, or rather almost all are holy men, like Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and others, from whose morals the vice of flattery was far removed, certainly it follows that Velenus, who calls these men flatterers of the Roman Curia, is lying shamelessly.

Furthermore, his argument has no value, For both regarding recent events and ancient ones errors can occur, when the things are done secretly and without witnesses, or regarding the number of years or similar circumstances, which are easily forgotten; but this does not happen concerning the sum and substance of famous events, especially when, besides the written testimonies, there are also many monuments of those things in stone or bronze, such as is the case with what we are dealing with here. And I thought that this could suffice for this whole dispute, about which I have received an outstanding book, published some time ago by John Roffensus, a man of blessed memory.

CHAPTER XII

IT IS PROVED FROM DIVINE LAW AND FROM THE NATURE OF SUCCESSION THAT THE ROMAN PONTIFF SUCCEEDS PETER IN THE ECCLESIASTICAL MONARCHY

So far we have demonstrated that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter as bishop of Rome. Now we will demonstrate the same thing concerning his succession in the primacy of the whole Church. All contemporary heretics deny this, but they fight especially against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff—such as Luther in his book on the power of the Pope, Illyricus in his book against the primacy of the Pope, the Smalkaldic Synod in its book, John Calvin in book 4, chapter 6 and 7 of his Institutes, the Magdeburgenses in the singular Centuries at the end in chapter 7. And before all of these there was Nilus, the bishop of Thessalonica, in a book against the primacy of the Pope.

For, this author does not deny that Peter was the pastor of the whole Church, and functioned as the bishop of Rome until his death; but he contends that the Roman Pontiff does not succeed Peter in the primacy of the whole Catholic Church, but only in the Roman episcopacy. But then he adds that the Roman Pontiff afterwards obtained a certain primacy from the decrees of the Councils, that is, that he should be the first of the bishops, that he should sit in the first place, that he should be the first to speak, but that he has no authority over all the others.

However, since both our arguments and those of the adversaries are taken from the same sources and heads, we will reduce the whole to a few chapters or kinds of arguments, and at the same time we will prove the truth, and we will also refute the objections of others.

First, therefore, it is proved that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the primacy of the whole Church by divine right and by reason of the succession. By divine right someone must succeed Peter: he cannot be anyone other than the Roman Pontiff; therefore he succeeds.

John Calvin denies both parts of this argument, for he says in book 4, chapter 6 § 8 of his Institutes: *It is true that concerning Peter I concede to them what they want, bin that is no reason why from one example they should make a universal rule, and that what happened once they should establish as something perpetual.* Again in § 11 he said: *Now I grant to them the other thing, which they will never obtain among sane men, that the primacy was so located in Peter that it would always remain with a perpetuo! succession; but from what source do they conclude that the chair was so located in Rome, that whoever is the bishop of that city presides over the whole world?*

We, therefore, will show both parts separately. And first of all, that someone must succeed Peter in the primacy of the whole Church is deduced from the purpose of the pontificate. For it is certain that the pontiff is for the sake of the Church, not the Church for the sake of the pontificate. Thus Augustine said in chapter 1 of his book on pastors: *That we are Christians is for our own sake, but that we are bishops is for your sake.* Bui now the Church has no less need of one pastor than she did at the time of the Apostles: indeed it is needed now even more, since Christians are not better or worse. Therefore, a'

the death of Peter the primacy should not perish, which was not instituted for the benefit of Peter but for the good of the Church; it was established to remain and to persevere, as long as the Church herself remains, or certainly as long as the earth exists and there is need for the care and vigilance of one supreme pastor.

Secondly, it is proved from the unity of the Church. For, the Church is one and the same at every time. Therefore, the form of government must not be changed, which is also the form of a republic or city. Therefore if at the time of the Apostles there was one supreme leader, and head of the Church, there must also be such a leader at this time.

Thirdly, it is proved from the words of the Lord in John 21: *Feed my sheep.* For, the office of pastor is an ordinary and perpetual office. Since from the nature of the matter the office of pastor should continue as long as the flock remains, but the flock does remain and will remain until the end of the world, therefore until then it is necessary that the successors of Peter should remain in that supreme pastoral office.

The fourth proof is from the same place. For, since the Lord says to Peter: *feed my sheep,* he commits all of his sheep to him, as we showed above, and that means not only all by reason of the place, but also by reason of the time, since Christ must care for us no less than he did for the early Christians. But Peter was not going to live always in the flesh, therefore when the Lord says to him: *Feed my sheep,* in him he is addressing *all* his successors. Therefore Chrysostom in book 2 on the priesthood, near the beginning, said: *Why did he shed his blood? Certainly it was to obtain those sheep whose care he committed to Peter and to Peter's successors.* And Leo in sermon 3 on the anniversary of his assumption to the pontificate said: *The dispensation of Truth therefore abides, and the blessed Peter persevering in the strength of the Rock, which he has received, has not abandoned the helm of the Church, that is, Peter persevered and lives in his successors.* And blessed Peter, the bishop of Ravenna, in a letter to Eutyches said: *Peter, who lives and presides in his own chair, presents the truth of the faith to those seeking it.*

Fifthly. The Church is one body, and here on earth she has her own head besides Christ, as is clear from 1 Cor. 12:21 where, after Paul said the Church is one body, he added: *The head cannot say to the feet, "I have no need of you."* Certainly this is not suitable for Christ, for he can say to all of us "I have no need of you"; but no other head can be assigned besides Peter, and the body of the Church should not remain without a head because of the death of Peter. Therefore it is necessary that someone succeed Peter.

Sixthly, in the Old Testament there was a succession of the high priests. For, Eleazar succeeded Aaron in Num. 20:26, and Phinehas succeeded Eleazar in Judg. 20:28, and so on concerning the other. But the priesthood of the Old Testament was s figure of the priesthood of the New Testament. Therefore also now succession in the chair of Peter, the first and supreme pontiff of Christians, must be preserved.

Finally, all the arguments, by which it was proved in the second question that the government of the Church must be monarchic, also prove the question we are now considering.

Indeed it can be proved easily that the Roman Pontiff is the successor of Peter. For there is no one, nor has there ever been, who in any way claimed that he was the successor of Peter, or ever was considered as such, except the Roman and Antiochene

bishop; but the Antiochene did not succeed Peter in the primacy of the whole Church, for there is no succession unless the chair is empty—either by natural death, or by a legitimate death, that is, deposition or renunciation. However, Peter while he was still living and functioning as bishop left the Church of Antioch, and established his chair in Rome, as we demonstrated in the previous question. The result is that the Roman bishop, who succeeds Peter in the city of Rome upon his death, succeeds him in all his dignity and power.

Furthermore, if the Antiochene bishop had succeeded Peter in his supreme pontificate, he would have been the first bishop; but the Council of Nicaea in canon 6 declared that the bishop of Antioch is the third patriarch, not the first or the second, as it always was, and the bishops of Antioch never sought a higher place.

But in order to understand this whole matter better, the following points should be noted. First, succession is one thing, but the reason for the succession is something else. For, the succession of Roman Pontiff in the primacy of Peter is from the institution of Christ; but the reason for the succession, whereby the Roman pontiff rather than the Antiochene or some other one succeeds, has its beginning from the fact of Peter. The succession itself, I say, is from a decision of Christ and by divine right, because Christ himself instituted in Peter a pontificate that is to last until the end of the world; and so whoever succeeds Peter receives the pontificate from Christ.

But that the Roman bishop, because he is the Roman bishop, is Peter's successor has its origin from the fact of Peter, not from the first institution of Christ. For, Peter could have selected no particular Chair for himself ever, as he did during the first five years; and then at the death of Peter, the Roman bishop would not have succeeded him, nor the Antiochene, but the one whom the Church chose for herself. Also, it could have remained always at Antioch, and then the Antiochene bishop doubtless would have succeeded him. But because he located his chair at Rome, and held it until his death, hence it came about that the Roman Bishop is the one who succeeds him.

And since Pope St. Marcellus in a letter to Antioch writes that Peter, at a command of the Lord, came to Rome, and St. Ambrose in the Oration against Auxentius, and Athanasius in his Apology for his flight say that Peter suffered martyrdom in Rome because of a command of the Lord, it is not improbable that the Lord also clearly ordered Peter to establish his chair in Rome, so that the Roman bishop absolutely would succeed him. But whatever the truth may be about this, at least this reason for the succession does not come from the first institution of the pontificate, which is recorded in the gospel.

Secondly, it should be observed: although perhaps it is not of divine right that the Roman pontiff, because he is the Roman pontiff, succeeds Peter in the primacy of the whole Church, nevertheless if someone absolutely asks whether by divine right the Roman pontiff is the pastor and head of the whole Church, the answer is most certainly Yes. For, for this nothing else is required but that the succession be of divine right, that is, that the ordinary office of governing the Church with supreme power is instituted not by men, but immediately by God; but that that is so, we demonstrated above.

Thirdly, it should be observed: although perhaps it is not of divine right that the Roman pontiff, as Roman pontiff, succeeds Peter, still this does pertain to Catholic faith.

For, these two are not the same thing—that something is a matter of faith, and that it is by divine right. For, it was not of divine right that Paul had a mantle, but still it is a matter of faith that Paul had a mantle. Although that the Roman pontiff succeeds Peter is not found expressly in the Scriptures, nevertheless that someone succeeds Peter is deduced evidently from the Scriptures. But that he is the Roman pontiff is known from the apostolic tradition of Peter, which tradition has been declared by general Councils, decrees of pontiffs, and the consensus of the Fathers, as will be demonstrated further on.

Finally, it should be observed that the Roman episcopacy, and the primacy of the whole Church, are not two episcopacies or two Sees, except potentially. For, Peter as the pontiff of the whole Church instituted by Christ did not join to himself the episcopacy of the city of Rome, as a bishop of some place joins to himself another episcopacy, or benefice, or abbey. But he raised the episcopacy of the city of Rome to be the supreme pontificate of the world, as when a simple episcopacy is raised to be an archepiscopacy, or a patriarchate. For, an archbishop or a patriarch is not a bishop two or three times, but only once, and a sign of this is that only one pallium is given to the Sovereign Pontiff, even though he is a bishop, archbishop, patriarch and sovereign pontiff: for all of these are one thing actually, and many only potentially.

From this it follows that the one who is elected to be the bishop of Rome by that very fact is the sovereign pontiff of the whole Church, even if by chance the electors do not express this. But now let us answer the objections of Nilus and Calvin.

The first objection of Nilus. The Roman pontiff had the primacy from the Fathers, because that city ruled the whole world, as we read in session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon; therefore he did not have it from his succession of Peter.

I respond that that decree was illegitimate, because it was done in contradiction to those who presided over the Council. We will have more to say about this in chapter 27.

The second objection. The Roman Pope is not an apostle, but only a bishop; for, the apostles did not ordain apostles, but pastors and teachers. Therefore the Roman Pope does not succeed Peter in apostolic power, which was in every Church, but only in the particular episcopacy of Rome.

I respond that three things are contained in the apostolate. First, that the one who is an apostle is the immediate minister of the word, so that he is taught by God himself and can write sacred books. And we admit that this does not pertain to the Roman pontiff; for it is not necessary that every day new revelations are had, and new sacred books are written.

Secondly, that the one who is an apostle establishes Churches, and spreads the faith in those places where it never was; this does pertain to the Roman pontiff, and both reason and experience teach us about this. For, since apostolic times it has been the Roman pontiffs who have established Churches in various parts of the world, and they are still doing that today.

Thirdly, that the one who is an apostle has power over the whole Church; and we also contend that this pertains to the Roman pontiff because he succeeds Peter, in whom this power is ordinary, not delegated as it was in the other apostles.

And the argument of Nilus does not conclude, since he says that apostles did not

The fifth objection is found in the same book 4, chapter 7 § 28: If the things said to Peter are understood as said also to his successors, then the Roman pontiffs must admit that they are all Satans; for, this was said to Peter in Matt. 16 in the same place where it was said to him: *I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven.*

I respond: The things said to Peter can be understood in three different ways. For, some things are said to him for himself alone, some things for himself and for all Christians, some things for himself and for his successors—and this is gathered evidently from the different ways in which they are said. For the things said to him as one of the faithful, certainly are meant for all the faithful. As in Matt. 18:15, *If your brother sins against you, etc.* The things said to him by reason of something proper to his person are meant for him alone, as for example: *Get behind me, Satan.* And: *You will deny me three times;* for those things are said to him because of his own stupidity and ignorance. Finally, some things are said to him because of the pastoral office, which therefore are understood as said to all his successors, as: *Feed my sheep.* And: *Strengthen your brothers;* and: *Whatever you bind, etc.*

Luther's arguments are trivial, and from what has been said can be easily refuted by anyone; moreover, they are carefully refuted by Eck, Fabro, Roffensus and Cajetan, whose books are available to all, and so I will not repeat them here.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE COUNCILS

In the second place the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is proved from the Councils. Now Luther in his book on the power of the pope, and Illyricus in his book against the primacy, and Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 1 of his Institutes say that the 6th canon of the Council of Nicaea openly militates against us; for in it a certain region to be governed is assigned to the Roman pontiff, and it is quite small. And he is declared to be one of the patriarchs, but not as the head of the others; and they say that the testimony of no Council can be found in our favor. Nevertheless there are some very clear testimonies of the general Councils for the primacy of the Roman pontiff, and among them some were so general that the Greeks and Latins took part in them. This should be noted in contrast to the levity and obstinacy of the Greeks.

First of all, therefore, we have the Council of Nicaea, and that canon 6, which the adversaries use as an objection: but that canon needs some explanation so that an argument can be drawn from it. Therefore canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea reads like this in the volumes on the Council that new exist: *An ancient custom continues in Egypt, and also in Libya and Pentapolis, that the Alexandrian bishop has power over all of them, since indeed the custom is that he is equal to the Roman bishop.*

But a few things must be pointed our regarding this canon.

First, from Nicolas I in a letter to Michael that the Council of Nicaea decreed nothing concerning the Roman Church, since her power is not from men but from God and that it is only from the form of the Roman Church that the status of the other Churches is established. For the Council does not say: *The Roman Church has the administration of this or that region,* but it does say: *The Alexandrian bishop has the care of Egypt and Libya, because the Roman bishop has so agreed.* There clearly the Roman bishop is the norm of the others, and nothing really is decreed concerning him. Therefore Calvin, Illyricus, Nilus and others are in error, since they say that certain limits have been assigned by the Council of Nicaea to the Roman bishop, namely, that he has the care only of the Churches near Rome.

Secondly, it is to be observed that in commonly known books the beginning of this canon is missing, and it says this: *The Roman Church always had the primacy, but a custom continues, etc.* For, in this wording the canon is cited in session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon by bishop Pascasius. So also more than a thousand years ago a certain abbot named Dionysius translated it from the Greek, as Alanus Copus noted down in Dialogue 1. Therefore in the same Council of Chalcedon, in session 16, after the reading of canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea, the judges said: *We think that all primacy and special honor, according to the canons, are preserved by the archbishop of ancient Rome, who is dear to God.*

It is to be observed thirdly that the words: *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed,* are usually explained in four ways.

First, Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 6 of his Ecclesiastical History explain that this

decree is from the Council so that the bishop of Alexandria could have the care of Egypt, as the bishop of Rome has the care of the Churches near Rome.

But this is a false explanation, for if the bishop of Rome is the first and special patriarch, how credible is it that a small region is assigned to him, but a much larger region to the other lesser patriarchs? For the Antiochene had the whole East, and the Alexandrian three large provinces—Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, but the Roman had only the suburban Churches, that is, the six dioceses near to Rome. Then the word "because" is a rational or causative word; but the reason is not good, since the Alexandrian bishop has the care of three provinces, because the Roman bishop has the care of the suburban Churches; therefore, either the reason of the Council is meaningless, or Ruffinus did not correctly explain the decree of the Council. Finally, the Council of Nicaea, neither as it is cited in Council VI of Carthage, nor as it is read at session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon, nor as it is reported in its own place in the Volume of the Council, nor as it is cited by the abbot Dionysius mention the suburban Churches of Rome, but it says only: *The Alexandrian bishop has the care of Egypt and Libya, because the Roman bishop has so agreed.* Therefore that was mere speculation on the part of Ruffinus, whom Calvin followed, regarding the suburban Churches of Rome.

The second explanation is that of Theodore Balsamonis in his explanation of the canonical hours, and of Nilus in his book against the primacy, namely, that the Alexandrian bishop has the care of all Egypt, just as the Roman bishop has the care of the whole West.

This opinion is more generous, but it is false nevertheless. For, the Council when it says: *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed,* gives the reason, as we have said, why the ancient custom should remain in Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis, that the bishop of Alexandria should have the care of those places. But the reason for this arrangement is not because the Roman bishop has the care of the West. For, how does this follow logically: the Roman bishop has the care of the West, therefore the Alexandrian bishop has the care of Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis? Why not rather all of Africa? Or why not only Egypt? Or why does the Alexandrian have that care, and not the Carthaginian or some other? Add to this the fact that the Council does not mention either West or East, but says only: *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed.*

The third explanation is that of the author of the Summa of the Councils who, based on some old codex, thinks the statement should be corrected from, *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed,* which is what we have, to the following: *Because such is the custom for the metropolitan.*

But this also is not a solid explanation. For, the documents of the Council of Nicaea have never existed more completely and correctly than in the archives of the ancient Roman pontiffs, as we shall show below, when we deal with appellations. For, those that were in Greece were burned up by the Arians, according to Athanasius in his letter to all the Orthodox bishops; and so it is not surprising, if the documents cited by the Greeks and Ruffinus are mutilated and corrupt.

In addition, the legate of St. Leo to the Council of Chalcedon took this canon from the archives of the Roman Church, and in it we read: *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed.* You can add to this that it is not a good reason why the Alexandrian bishop

should have the care of such a region, because the metropolitans were so accustomed. For, metropolitans rule over only one province, but many provinces and many metropolitans are subject to the bishop of Alexandria.

Therefore, the fourth and true explanation is that the Alexandrian bishop should rule over those provinces, because the Roman bishop has agreed to it, that is, because the Roman bishop, before all definitions of Councils, was accustomed to permit the bishop of Alexandria to rule over Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis; or, he was accustomed to govern those provinces through the bishop of Alexandria. It is in this way that Nicolaus I understood this canon in his letter to Michael, and no other explanation seems to be probable.

The second general Council in a letter to Damasus, which is found in book 5, chapter 9 in Theodoretus's Histoiy, says that they assembled in the city of Constantinople through the mandate of a pontifical letter sent to them through the Emperor. And in that letter they say that the Roman Church is the head, and that they are the members.

The third Council, as it is found in book 1, chapter 4 of Evagrius's History, says that they deposed Nestorius because of the command contained in a letter from Celestine, the Roman Pope. And in a letter to the same Celestine, the same Council writes that they did not dare to judge the case of John, the patriarch of Antioch, which was more doubtful than the case of Nestorius, and so they reserved it for the judgment of Celestine himself. All of these points clearly indicate the supreme authority of the Roman Pontiff. The Council of Chalcedon in sessions 1,2 and 3, passim call Leo *the pontiff of the whole Church.* And in the letter to Leo they say: *And after all of this, even against him to whor the care of the vine has been committed by the Savior, he extends this madness, that is also against your apostolic holiness.* Here you see that the greatest Council confesses that to the Roman pontiff the custody of the vine has been given by God himself, that is, the care of the whole Church.

The synod of Constantinople, which was assembled before the fifth Council regarding the case of Anthimus, in session 4, by the patriarch Menas, president of the Council, said the following: *We follow the apostolic See, and we obey it; we consider his ambassadors as our ambassadors, and we condemn those condemned by him.* Now if the whole Council professes that it obeys the apostolic See, then certainly the apostolic See presides over the whole Church with authority.

The seventh Council in session 2 accepts and approves the letter of Adrian to Tharsius, in which the words are included: *His chair, obtaining primacy over the whole world, shines forth, and he is the head of all the Churches of God. Hence also the Apostle St. Peter himself, by the command of God, feeds the Church; he has neglected absolutely nothing, but everywhere he has obtained the primacy, and he is obtaining it, etc.* Note that it is said in the present tense: *Obtaining the primacy, he shines forth.* And: *He is the head, etc.*

Lateran Council IV under Innocent III, at which Greeks and Latins were present, in chapter 5 said: *The Roman Church, through the disposition of the Lord, has a primacy of ordinary power over all the other Churches, inasmuch as she is the mother and teacher of all Christ's faithful.*

The Second Council of Lyons under Gregory X calls the Roman bishop the vicar of Christ, the successor of Peter, the leader of the whole Church; and also in this Council both Greeks and Latins were present.

Finally, the Council of Florence, with both Greeks and Latins agreeing, decreed the following: *We define that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman pontiff have the primacy over the whole world and that the same Roman pontiff is the successor of blessed Peter, the prince of the apostles and the true vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, the father and teacher of all Christians; and that to him, in the person of blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the whole Church.* I omit the other five general Councils, because they are not recognized by the Greeks, who were not present, nor by the Lutherans, since they were celebrated after the year 600. They are Lyons I under Innocent IV, Vienne under Clement V, Constance in sessions 8 and 15, Lateran V under Leo X in session 11, and Trent in session 14, chapter 7, and elsewhere.

CHAPTER XIV

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE TESTIMONIES OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFFS

The third argument is taken from the decisions of the Sovereign Pontiffs. But it should be noted that the letters of the pontiffs can fall into three classes.

The first class contains the letters of pontiffs, who reigned until the year 300, in which the Magdeburgenses and Calvin admit that the primacy is truly asserted, and that they were holy pontiffs and true pontiffs; but they say that their letters are faked, and recent, and falsely attributed to those pontiffs.

The second class includes the letters of the pontiffs, who reigned from the year 600 until our times, in which the adversaries admit that the primacy is truly asserted, and their authors are those to whom they are attributed; but they say that those pontiffs are not worthy of belief, that they are pseudo-pontiffs and not really pontiffs.

The third class comprehends the letters, in which the primacy is both openly asserted, and concerning which it is certain that they were written by holy and true pontiffs, who lived from the year 300 until 600, namely, Julius, Damasus, Syricius, InnocenL Zozimus, Leo, Gelasius, Anastasius II, John II, Felix IV, Pelagius II, Gregory the Great. Therefore, in the testimonies of the first and second classes, it will not be necessary to delay in citinj their words, but it will be sufficient to note the places, and to respond to the objection, of the heretics, since they admit that our position is openly asserted in those letters. Accordingly, the words and quotes to be presented will come only from the testimonies of the third class.

First of all, therefore, these pontiffs clearly assert the primacy: Clement in letter 1, Anacletus in letter 3, Evaristus in letter 1, Alexander in letter 1, Pius in letters 1 and 2, Anicetus in letter 1, Victor in letter 1, Zephyrinus in letter 1, Calixtus in letter 2, Lucius in letter 1, Marcellus in letter 1, Eusebius in letter 3, Melchiades in letter 1, Mark in letter 1.

They give no response to these testimonies, except to say that they are recent and not genuine. Although I do not deny that some errors are found in them, nor do I dare to affirm that they are indubitable; but certainly I do not doubt that they are very ancient, for the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 2, chapter 7 at the end are lying when they say that no author worthy of belief quoted these letters before the time of Charlemagne. For Isidore, who lived 200 years before Charlemagne, in the preface to his collection of the holy canons, says that, from a consultation of 80 bishops, he gathered together canons from the letters of Clement, Anacletus, Evaristus, and other Roman pontiffs. Likewise, the Council of Vasensis in canon 6 cites the letters of Clement as they now exist. And this Council was held under Leo I, that is, 350 years before the empire of Charlemagne. Finally, Ruffinus, who preceded Charlemagne by 400 years, in the Preface of the recognitions of Clement translated by himself from Greek, mentions the letter of Clement to James, and says that he translated it from Greek. Gennadius in the book on illustrious men, in the essay of Ruffinus, says that this translation of Ruffinus is the true one.

In the second class there is Adrian I in the letter to Thrasius, Nicolaus I in the letter

to the Emperor Michael, Leo IX to Michael the bishop of Constantinople, Paschal in a letter to the bishop of Palermo, Innocent III in a letter to the Emperor of Constantinople. All of these earnestly and explicitly teach that the Roman pontiff presides over the whole Church.

To this the adversaries respond: these pontiffs were all Antichrists; in the following question we will refute this claim. In the meantime we say only this: if those pontiffs were Antichrists, then the whole Church ceased to exist for almost 1000 years. For it is certain from the histories that the whole Church adhered to these pontiffs, and followed their direction. But if the Church perished, then Christ lied who, because he said in Matt. 16:18 that the gates of hell would never prevail against it. But we will have many things to say about this in the treatise on the Church. Let us now come to the third class and examine twelve excellent and holy pontiffs.

The first is St. Julius I, who in a letter to Eastern bishops, which is found in Apology 2 of Athanasius, says this: *Did you perhaps not know that this was the custom: that first you write to us and thus what is just is determined from here? If, therefore, something of this kind was suspected regarding the bishop there, this Church should have been informed of it.* And after that: *These things* (he said) *we have received from St. Peter the Apostle, and I am pointing them out to you and I think you know them very well.* With these words St. Julius says that the office of judging the problems of bishops pertains to himself, also those of the Orientals, even though the patriarchs are primary (for he was dealing with the case of St. Athanasius, the patriarch of Alexandria) and he says he received this right from St. Peter, and that it is well known to all. What response, I ask, can be given to this? The author is holy and very ancient; the letter is certain and fully described by St. Athanasius; finally, the words are evident and clear.

The second is St. Damasus who, in a letter to all the Eastern Bishops, which Theodoretus quotes in book 3, chapter 10 of his History, said: *Since your charity has given due reverence to the apostolic See, you have shown yourselves to be very dear sons to the best of your ability.* Here he acknowledges the due reverence and he calls all the bishops "sons." Similarly in letter 4 to the bishops of Numidia he said: *All the things that can fall under some doubt you will not hesitate to refer to us as the head, as has always been the custom.*

Thirdly. St. Siricius in a letter to Bishop Himerius of Tarragona, which Calvin also admits is truly authentic: *In regard to Our duty, We are not free to hide or to remain silent, since it is incumbent on Us more than all to have a greater zeal for the Christian religion. We carry the weight of all who are oppressed; or rather, these are borne in us by the blessed apostle Peter, who, in all things, as We trust, protects and defends the successors of his ministry.* And after that in chapter 15: *We have explained, I think, dear brother, all the things involved in this dispute, and in the particular cases, concerning which through our son the priest Bassianus you have referred to the Roman Church as the head of your body, etc.* Then he commands the bishop to send his decrees to all the other bishops.

Fourthly. St. Zozimus in a letter to Bishop Hesichius of Salona said: *To you especially We have directed the letters, which you will make known to all our brothers and bishops.*

Fifthly. St. Innocent I in letter 22 to the bishops of Macedonia said: *I perceived that*

injury was done to the apostolic See, to which the report was sent as to the head of the Churches. Likewise in a letter to the Council of Mileum, which is number 93 among the letters of St. Augustine: *It is with diligence and good order that you are consulting the resources of the apostolic office—that office, I say, which retains, apart from other things, anxiety for all the Churches, asking what opinion should be held in regard to points of controversy; you have, of course, followed the practice of the ancient norm that you know has always been observed by all the world with me.* The same Pope in a letter to the Council of Carthage, which is number 91, says that the Roman See is *the fount and head of all the Churches.*

To this testimony the Magdeburgenses respond only that Innocent claims too much for himself; accordingly they insult him by calling him "the guilty one" *(Nocentius).* But if that is the case: why did the old Fathers not reprehend this error of Innocent? Why did Augustine say in his letter 106 to Paulinus, while referring to these two letters of Innocent: *Concerning all those things he wrote them for us in the same way as was the custom and as was necessary for the occupant of the apostolic See?* Why in the same place does Augustine call Innocent the Pope of blessed memory?

The sixth is St. Leo. But since Luther and Calvin say that the old pontiffs had no authority outside the West, we will present the testimonies of Leo, by which at the same time the primacy is asserted, and it is shown that he exercised jurisdiction at that time over the bishops in Greece, Asia, Egypt and Africa. Therefore, in letter 84 to Bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica he said: *Just as my predecessors are your predecessors, st also I, having followed the prior example of your charity, have delegated to you the offici of my direction, so that you may provide the care, which we are required principally to offer for the whole Church because of the divine institution, being an imitator of our gentleness; and in provinces far away from the apostolic See you offer a presence that is like a visitation from us.* And after that: *We have entrusted to your charity our place, so that you have been called to take part in our solicitude, not in the fullness of power.* And at the end, where he says that the bishops, archbishops and primates have been established by divine providence, he adds: *Through whom the care of the whole Church comes to the one chair of Peter, and nothing will ever separate them from its head.* From these texts not only the primacy but also the authority of Leo over the Churches of Greece is apparent.

The same Leo in letter 46 to Bishop Anatholius of Constantinople said: *To you who are living there, to whom we enjoined the carrying out of our direction, etc.* Here you see that he commands the patriarch of Constantinople. The same Pope, in letter 62 to Maximus of Antioch, admonished him that he should write back frequently concerning the affairs of the Churches. And in the same place he said: *Bishop Juvenal believed that he would be sufficient in order to obtain the primacy over the province of Palestine. That Cyril of holy memory rightly abhorred this, he made known to me by his letters, and with earnest prayers he strongly requested that no agreement be given to illicit undertakings.* Here you see how the patriarch of Alexandria beseeches Leo not to permit Juvenal to take over Palestine. And since that province was under the authority of the patriarch of Antioch, why did Cyril not rather seek this from the patriarch of Antioch?

constitute apostles, but pastors. For the apostles did not create the Roman pontiff the pontiff of the whole Church, since Christ himself did that. Therefore the See of the Roman pontiff by all the Fathers has always been called the apostolic See, and the Council of Chalcedon, which Nilus quotes, in session 1 refers to the dignity of the apostolate of the Roman pope, and in session 16 his See is called apostolic.

The third objection. Peter was the pastor and teacher of the whole world; but the pope both is and is called only the bishop of the city of Rome.

I respond: that is false, as can be known from the Council of Chalcedon itself, without citing other Councils. For, in session 3 three letters are read of the Orientals to Leo, and in all of them Leo is called the Pope of the whole Church, and this same name is also used in session 16.

The fourth objection. Peter ordained the bishops of Antioch and Alexandria, but the Roman Pope is not permitted to do that.

I respond: although now the obstinacy of the Greeks does not permit this, still formerly it was allowed for the Roman pontiff to do this. For at the Council of Chalcedon, in session 7, we read that Maximus, the bishop of Antioch, was accepted by the Council because he had been confirmed in the episcopate by St. Leo. And Liberatus in chapter 21 of the Breviarium and John Zonaras on Justinian write that Anthimus was deposed as bishop of Constantinople by the Roman Pontiff Agapitus, and that by the same Pontiff Menas was ordained to take his place. But there will be more about this later in its proper place.

The fifth objection. Whatever Peter said or wrote was an oracle of the Holy Spirit; out that does not pertain to the pope; therefore the pope does not have all the prerogatives bf Peter.

I respond: and we do not claim that he does.

The sixth objection. It was said to Peter unconditionally: *Whatever you bind on earth, shall be bound, etc.* But Peter prescribed for the Roman pope that he bind only that, or loose only that which deservedly should be bound or loosed.

I respond that nothing else is proved by the argument except that Nilus truly was a Greek, that is, light-minded and garrulous. For who ever heard that Peter was allowed to bind what really ought not to be bound? And where can that prescription of Peter to the pope be found which Nilus cites?

Calvin's first objection is in book 4, chapter 6 § 8. It does not follow, he says, if Peter at the beginning presided over the twelve apostles that now one person should preside over the whole world. For a few people can be ruled easily and efficiently by one person, but many thousands can be governed only my many.

I respond first of all that Peter presided not only over the 12 apostles, but also over many thousands of Christians. For, in John 21 Christ committed to Peter not only the 12 apostles, but all of his sheep. Thus we read in Acts 2 that the sheep of Peter increased by three thousand, and in Acts 4 to five thousand in Jerusalem alone. Also, where there are many men there is even more need for one leader, by whom they can be kept in unity. But this matter was covered already in the first question.

The second objection is found in the same place in § 11: If therefore the chair of

the supreme pontificate is in Rome, because the Apostle Peter while functioning as the bishop of Rome died there, then the chair of the Jewish pontificate should always be in the wilderness, because Moses and Aaron, functioning as leaders, died there. And the pontifical chair of Christians ought to be in Jerusalem, because Christ the supreme pontiff died there.

I respond based on what has been said: The pontifical See is not in Rome because Peter died there, but because he was the Bishop of Rome, and he never transferred his See to any other place. Moses and Aaron did not fix their chair in the wilderness, but they died while they were journeying there, just as Christ did not fix his chair in Jerusalem, or in any particular place, as we said above.

The third objection is found in the same place in § 12: This privilege of the primacy of the whole Church is either local, or personal, or mixed. If local, then since it was first given to Antioch, it cannot be taken away from there, even if Peter left from there and died elsewhere. If personal, then it does not pertain to a place; therefore Rome does not have any more right to the primacy than any other city. If mixed, then it does not suffice to be the Roman pontiff in order to have the primacy; for if it is a privilege that is partly local and partly personal, then it does not pertain to a place except for the time during which such a person is present, that is, Peter.

I respond that from the first institution of Christ the pontifical dignity was personal; however, from the fact of Peter afterwards it was made local, or rather mixed, and that was not without the divine approval. I say that it was personal at the beginning, because it was not tied by Christ to any certain place, but it was conferred on the person of Petei absolutely. However, I am saying that it was personal in such a way that it was also public, and not something private.

Personal privileges are said to be private, which are given to some person for himself alone; but those are public which are given for oneself and for successors. But because later Peter fixed his See in Rome, this privilege also became local, and therefore mixed. For, it is tied to the city of Rome, as long as the successors of Peter retain their chair in Rome. For if, by a divine command, the See were moved somewhere else, the Roman bishops would no longer be the bishops of the whole Church; if the See were moved, I say, so that those who now are the Roman bishops were said to be the bishops of some other place. For the mere absence of the pontiffs from the city does not mean that the chair is moved. But these things are said only hypothetically, for we do not think it will ever happen that the chair of Peter will be transferred to some other place.

The fourth objection is found in the same place in § 13: If the Roman pontiff, because he succeeds Peter, is the first bishop, then Ephesus should be second, Jerusalem third, and so with regard to the others. But we see that Alexandria was second, which did not succeed any apostle; and Ephesus could not be put in the last place.

I respond that the order and number of the patriarchal Sees does not depend on the dignity of the first bishops, otherwise there would not be three, but twelve because of the number of the apostles; but it depends on the dignity and will of Peter alone, as we showed from Anacletus, Leo, Gelasius and Gregory in question three regarding the prerogatives of Peter.

CHAPTER XIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE COUNCILS

In the second place the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is proved from the Councils. Now Luther in his book on the power of the pope, and Illyricus in his book against the primacy, and Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 1 of his Institutes say that the 6th canon of the Council of Nicaea openly militates against us; for in it a certain region to be governed is assigned to the Roman pontiff, and it is quite small. And he is declared to be one of the patriarchs, but not as the head of the others; and they say that the testimony of no Council can be found in our favor. Nevertheless there are some very clear testimonies of the general Councils for the primacy of the Roman pontiff, and among them some were so general that the Greeks and Latins took part in them. This should be noted in contrast to the levity and obstinacy of the Greeks.

First of all, therefore, we have the Council of Nicaea, and that canon 6, which the adversaries use as an objection: but that canon needs some explanation so that an argument can be drawn from it. Therefore canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea reads like this in the volumes on the Council that new exist: *An ancient custom continues in Egypt, and also in Libya and Pentapolis, that the Alexandrian bishop has power over all of them, since indeed the custom is that he is equal to the Roman bishop.*

But a few things must be pointed our regarding this canon.

First, from Nicolas I in a letter to Michael that the Council of Nicaea decreed nothing concerning the Roman Church, since her power is not from men but from God and that it is only from the form of the Roman Church that the status of the other Churches is established. For the Council does not say: *The Roman Church has the administration of this or that region,* but it does say: *The Alexandrian bishop has the care of Egypt and Libya, because the Roman bishop has so agreed.* There clearly the Roman bishop is the norm of the others, and nothing really is decreed concerning him. Therefore Calvin, Illyricus, Nilus and others are in error, since they say that certain limits have been assigned by the Council of Nicaea to the Roman bishop, namely, that he has the care only of the Churches near Rome.

Secondly, it is to be observed that in commonly known books the beginning of this canon is missing, and it says this: *The Roman Church always had the primacy, but a custom continues, etc.* For, in this wording the canon is cited in session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon by bishop Pascasius. So also more than a thousand years ago a certain abbot named Dionysius translated it from the Greek, as Alanus Copus noted down in Dialogue 1. Therefore in the same Council of Chalcedon, in session 16, after the reading of canon 6 of the Council of Nicaea, the judges said: *We think that all primacy and special honor, according to the canons, are preserved by the archbishop of ancient Rome, who is dear to God.*

It is to be observed thirdly that the words: *Because the Roman bishop has so agreed,* are usually explained in four ways.

First, Rufiinus in book 10, chapter 6 of his Ecclesiastical History explain that this

The same Pope in letter 81 to Dioscorus, the patriarch of Alexandria, said: *What we know was preserved by our Fathers with great care, we want this to be protected by you also, etc.* You can see here that Leo gives a command to the patriarch of all Egypt and Libya. Again in letter 87 he said to the bishops of Africa: *What we in any way suffer to be venial, afterwards will not be able to go unpunished, if anyone, which we absolutely forbid, should presume to be responsible for it.* And after that: *We order that the case of Bishop Lupicinus be heard here.* Leo, therefore, is giving orders to the bishops of Greece, Asia, Egypt and Africa. There are also letters of his in existence to the bishops of Germany, Gaul and Italy in which he openly acknowledges that he is their judge and head.

Finally, in sermon 1 on the birth of the Apostles he addresses the city of Rome with these words: *Through the holy chair of blessed Peter you preside as head of the world more extensively by the divine religion than you do by earthly domination. For although you have grown through many victories, and you have extended the rule of your empire on land and on sea, what your wars have made subject to you is less than what the peace of Christ has brought to you.* What could be clearer?

To these quotations Calvin responds in two ways in book 4, chapter 7 § 11 of his Institutes. First of all he says that Leo was excessively avid for glory and domination, and that many resisted his ambition. In order to prove this he cites words in the margin of his letter 83.

But in that letter no such thing exists, nor do we find in other letters that anyone resisted St. Leo, with the exception of one bishop in Gaul, whose name was Hilary. It is read only in letter 89 that he wanted to remove himself from obedience to the apostolic See. However, as we read in the same place, he went to Rome to defend his case, and having been convicted by a tribunal he was punished. But there are among the letters of Leo letters of various Councils, bishops, and emperors to Leo himself, and particularly letters of the bishops of Gaul, in which his piety and authority are wonderfully proclaimed. And I do not think that before Luther and Calvin there was anyone who accused blessed Leo of pride and ambition.

Secondly, Calvin responds that Leo did not usurp for himself jurisdiction over other bishops, but only interposed himself in solving disagreements to the extent that the law and nature of ecclesiastical communion allowed. And he proves this, because the same Leo in letter 84 seems forcefully to command the bishops; but Calvin says he wanted to preserve in all of them the privileges of the metropolitans, as if he were to say, that he is admonishing them out of a sense of filial piety, but that authority remains in those who possess it.

But if that is the case, then he was not avid for gloiy and domination, nor should he be accused of ambition. Then, the words themselves of Leo, which were cited above, quite clearly indicate that he commanded the bishops truly and on the basis of his authority. But that he wants to preserve the rights of the metropolitans does not damage our position in any way; for, he wants them to be preserved in such a way that at the same time they are subject to the apostolic See, and to his vicar. For this is what he says in letter 84: *Therefore, according to the canons of the holy Fathers approved by the spirit of God,*

and consecrated by the approval of the whole world, and regarding the metropolitan bishops of the individual provinces, to whom by our delegation the care of your fraternity is extended, we decree that he has an inviolate right to the dignity bestowed on him long ago, so that they should not depart from the established rules by any negligence or presumption. And after that he said: *If by chance among those who preside, a case should arise concerning major sins, which cannot be handled by a provincial examination, the metropolitan will take care to instruct your fraternity concerning the nature of the whole affair, and if between the opposed parties the matter is not resolved by your judgment, the matter should be brought to our attention, whatever it may be.*

Seventhly. Gelasius says the following in a letter to the bishop of the Dardanelles: *Every Church throughout the world knows that, when there is a conflict between bishops, the See of blessed Peter the Apostle has the right to resolve it. Just as she has the right of judging concerning every Church, and it is not allowed for anyone to judge her.* He says similar things in a letter to the Emperor Anastasius and in the tome on anathemas. No response can be given to these words; for, it is certain that these truly are the words of Gelasius, and that Gelasius was a holy man, and that he presided over the Church a thousand years ago.

In the eighth place there is John II, who also ruled over a thousand years ago, in a letter to Justinian, which is contained in the codex of Justinian under title 1: *Among the bright praises,* he said, *of your wisdom and mildness, most Christian of princes, it shines forth with a light brighter than any star, because with a love of the faith, and taught by your zeal for charity you preserve reverence for the ecclesiastical discipline of the Roman See, and you subject all things to it, and you direct them to her unity, to her author, that is, the first of the Apostles; for, at the word of the Lord the precept given to him was, "Feed my sheep," which means that he is the head of all the Churches.*

In the ninth place there is the letter of Anastasius II to the Emperor Anastasius I: *Through the ministry,* he said, *of my humility, as is always the case with the See of blessed Peter in the whole Church, he holds the primacy conferred on him by the Lord.*

In the tenth place there is Felix IV who, in letter 1 to various bishops, said: *The letter of your holiness that you sent to the apostolic See as to the head, so that you might receive a response to it, and from which every Church in the whole region took its beginning, I have gratefully received, etc.*

In the eleventh place there is Pelagius II, who in letter 1 to the bishops of the East said: *The Roman See, by the institution of the Lord, is head of all the Churches.*

In the twelfth place there is St. Gregory the Great who, no less than Leo, acknowledged that he is the head of the whole Church in book 1, letter 72 to Gennadius: *If any from the Council of Numidia,* he said, *should desire to come to the Apostolic See, permit them to do so; and stop any who may be disposed to bring charges against their character.* Therefore, from these words the authority of Gregory over the bishops of Africa is apparent. Likewise, in book 2, letter 37 to Bishop Natalis: *When you had been forbidden in writing by our predecessor of holy memory to retain in your heart the soreness of your long displeasure against Honoratus your archdeacon, and when this had been positively interdicted you by myself also, you, disregarding the commands of God, and setting at*

naught our letters, attempted by a cunning device to degrade the aforesaid Honoratus your archdeacon under color of promoting him to a higher dignity. If anyone of the four patriarchs had done this, such obstinacy could in no way have taken place without grave scandal. Certainly with these words St. Gregory demonstrates clearly that he is placed above all the patriarchs.

Likewise in book 4, letter 56 to the bishops of the province of Greece he said: *You know that we have transmitted the pallium to our brother John, bishop of the Corinthians, whom it is very fitting that you obey.* Do you see here the authority of Gregory over the Greek bishops, for whom he ordains the bishop of Corinth as archbishop by the transmission of the pallium? The same Pope in book 7, letter 63 to John, bishop of Syracuse, said: *Now concerning the Church at Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the apostolic See? This is something that the devout Emperor and our brother Eusebius, bishop of the same city, constantly acknowledge openly.* And in letter 64 to the same person he wrote: *Now since he says they are subject to the apostolic See, if some fault is found among the bishops, I do not know of any bishop who is not subject to him.* What could be clearer? I am omitting the letters to the bishops of Italy, Gaul and Spain, because there is no doubt about their subjection.

Calvin responds in book 4, chapter 7 § 11, and he says first of all that Gregory claimed for himself the right of correcting others, but it is not evident that they appeared unless they came voluntarily. But this cannot be said: for Gregory was a holy and humble man; and because of that the Greeks also celebrate a feast day in his honor. And Calvin also in this book 4, chapter 7 § 22 admits that Gregory was a holy man; but the violation of the rights of another person cannot be reconciled with holiness. And it is not a blemish or a venial sin to subject all the bishops to oneself, but insufferable pride and a clear sign of the Antichrist, as they frequently teach: therefore, how was Gregory a holy man, if he unjustly subjected all the bishops to himself?

Secondly, he responds that Gregory judged the bishop of Constantinople at the command of the Emperor, as can be known from book 7, letter 64 of Gregory himself. But in that letter Gregory says that the Emperor wanted the patriarch to be judged by himself (Gregory), because the canons require this; which is the same as if he said that the Emperor did not want to hinder the bishop from being punished by Gregory, even though he was the bishop of the imperial city. Wherefore in the previous letter Gregoiy says that the Emperor strongly agreed that the Church in Constantinople was subject to the Church of Rome.

Thirdly, he responds that Gregory, just as he punished others, so also was ready to be corrected by others, as he himself says in book 2, letter 37 to Natalis, bishop of Salona, and so he was no more presiding than he was a subject. But Gregory in that letter is speaking about fraternal correction, not about a judicial censure: *Behold,* he said, yoi/r *fraternity resents having been reprimanded by me because of your feastings; you should be willing to accept this, just as I am prepared to be corrected by all, and I consider only him to be my friend by whose advice, before the appearance of the district judge, I can remove the stains on my soul.* You can add that this involves a contradiction, in that the same bishop is a prelate for all and still he is subject to some.

Fourthly, he responds that this status of the pontiffs was very displeasing to Gregory; for he constantly complains that, because he was a bishop, he had to return to the world, as he says in book 1, letter 5 and 7. Yes, Gregory did bewail the fact that he was transferred from the silence of the monastery to the burdens of a bishop; but it was not displeasing to him that the apostolic See had the care of all the Churches. For, the very same man passionately fought for the honor of his See against John, the bishop of Constantinople. And in book 4, letter 36 to Eulogius he said: *We hold on to humility in the heart, and still we preserve the dignity of our office with honor.* And in book 11, letter 42 to Bishop John of Panormus he said: *We give this admonition that reverence for the apostolic See should not be disturbed by the presumption of anyone. For then the status of the members remains solid, if the head of faith is not wounded by any injury.* And in his explanation of the fourth penitential Psalm he said: *He extends the temerity of his power so much, that the head of all the Churches vindicates for himself the Roman Church, and he replaces the right of the earthly power to become ruler of the nations.*

CHAPTER XV

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE GREEK FATHERS

Let us come now to the testimonies of the old Fathers, who were not sovereign pontiffs. Calvin and Illyricus raise only three objections against us—from Cyprian, Jerome and Bernard, which we will consider in their proper place. But for their three objections we will present almost thirty in response to them.

Therefore, the first is: Blessed Ignatius, who in his letter to the Romans dedicates it with these words: *Ignatius, to the holy Church, which presides in the region of the Romans.* Why does he say "Church which presides," unless because it is the head of all the others?

Secondly. Blessed Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 3 said: *We are pointing out that tradition derived from the apostles, of the very great, the very ancient, and universally known Church founded and organized at Rome by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul; as also [by pointing out] the faith preached to men, which comes down to our time by means of the successions of the bishops. For it is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Church, on account of its preeminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist everywhere.*

Note that, *it is a matter of necessity;* and that, *every Church should agree.* And that, *on account of its preeminent authority;* and that, *the tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist everywhere.*

For, Irenaeus proves that we can confound all the heretics from the teaching of the Roman Church, because it is necessary that all should agree with this Church, and that they should depend on her as on their head and fount. And therefore it is necessary that her teaching is apostolic and true. And so he proves that it is necessary for all Christians to depend on the Roman Church.

First, he argues a priori, because the primacy had been given to this Church. Secondly, a posteriori, because until now all have always preserved the faith in this Church, that is, in union with and adherence to this Church, as to their head and mother.

Thirdly. Epiphanius in Heresies 68, which is Meletian. *Ursacius,* he said, *and Valens, doing their penance, took their petitions and went to see blessed Julian, the Roman bishop, to give an account of their error and crime.* Certainly those men were bishops; therefore, why did they seek forgiveness from the Roman pontiff, if the Roman pontiff is not also the judge and head of the bishops?

Fourthly. Athanasius in Apology 2 says that the same bishops sought pardon for their sin from blessed Julian. And in a letter to Pope Felix he said: *Because of that he constituted you and your predecessors, that is, the apostolic leaders, at the top of the summit, and he commanded you to care for all the Churches, so that you might come to our aid, etc.* Finally, in a book on the opinion of Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria he said: *Some in the Church were thinking correctly, but they did not know why that was written by him. So they went to Rome, and there they accused him before Dionysius the Roman bishop.*

Why, I ask, was Dionysius, the patriarch of Alexandria, accused by good men before the Roman Pontiff, unless it was because they knew that the Roman pontiff is the common judge of all?

Fifthly. Basil in letter 52 to Athanasius said: *It seemed fitting to write to the Roman bishop, so that he might see our situation and render a decree of his judgment. But because it is difficult that some should be sent concerning the decree of the Council, he handed over authority in the matter to good men, who are able to undertake the difficult journey, with ease and facility, in order to warn those who have abandoned the right way with a proper and prudent prayer; and they will evaluate the acts of the Council of Ariminum in order to rescind those that were enacted there in an improper way, etc.* Here Basil attributes to the Roman bishop authority to visit the Churches of the East, and by his authority to accept or reject the decrees of a general Councils, like the one at Ariminum.

Sixthly. St. Gregoiy Nazianzen in a poem on his life says that the Roman Church always preserved the true teaching about God, which is fitting for the city that rules the world. And he is not speaking about a temporal empire, for at the time the headquarters of the Roman Empire was in Constantinople, not in Rome.

Seventhly. St. John Chrysostom in letter 1 to Pope Innocent said: *I beseech you to write that these things which were done unjustly do not have any value, and that those who have acted unjustly will be subject to the punishment of ecclesiastical laws, etc.* Theophilus the bishop of Alexandria, in a Council of many bishops, had deposed Chiysostom from the episcopacy of Constantinople. So Chrysostom writes to the Roman pontiff asking that, by his authority, he should declare the decision of Theophilus invalid, and also punish Theophilus himself. Therefore, Chrysostom acknowledges that Pope Innocent is the supreme judge also of the Greeks. Likewise in letter 2 to the same Pope he said: *We give constant thanks to you, because you have declared your paternal benevolence towards us, etc.*

Chrysostom acknowledges Innocent as his father, even though he was older than Innocent, and also the bishop of the royal city. Finally, in the same letter he beseeches Innocent not to excommunicate his enemies, although they really deserved it: *I ask,* he *Sdid, for you vigilance, that although they are causing much confusion, if they are to be cured of their disease, that they not be ill-treated or excommunicated.*

Eighthly. St. Cyril in letter 10 to Nestorius and in letter 10 to the clergy and people of Constantinople writes that Nestorius, if he does not renounce his heresies within the time prescribed by Pope Celestine, should be avoided by all as excommunicated and deposed. And in letter 18 to Celestine, whom in the address he calls his holy father, he asks him: whether he still wants to be in communication with Nestorius, or whether in the foture he should be avoided by all. All of these points sufficiently declare the importance St. Cyril attributed to the Roman pontiff, since in the condemnation and deposition of Nestorius he showed himself to be nothing other than the executor and administrator of the Roman pontiff. And in the book on the Treasury he said: *To Peter by divine right all bow their heads, and the princes of the world obey him as they would the Lord Jesus himself.* Likewise: *We, who are the members, must cling to our head the Roman pontiff, and to the apostolic See, etc.*

These words are not found in the copies of the book on the Treasury, which are now in existence, but they are cited by the blessed Thomas in his little book against the Greeks, and by Gennadius Scholarius, a Greek author, in a book on the primacy of the Roman pontiff. It is certain that many copies of this book on the Treasury have perished; for, it is cited in Council VI in session 10, as book 32 of the Treasury of Cyril, but now there are only fourteen books in existence. Moreover, Bishop Andreas of Colossae, in session 7 of the Council of Florence, said that in the Treasury of Cyril the authority of the Roman pontiff is proclaimed wonderfully, and none of the Greeks contradicted it.

Ninthly. Theodoretus in a letter to Pope Leo said: *I am waiting for a decision from your apostolic See, and I ask and beseech your holiness, that your just and correct judgment may provide help for me in my appeal, and order me to come to you and show you my teaching which follows the apostolic example.*

This bishop was an Asian and he presided over 800 Churches, as he says in the letter, and nevertheless he acknowledges that the Roman pontiff is his supreme judge. The same bishop in a letter to the priest Renatus said: *They have deprived me of my priesthood, and they have expelled me from their cities, and they have not shown respect for my years in religion and my old age. On this account I beseech you that you convince the holy archbishop Leo to use his apostolic authority and to order me to come to your Council. For that holy See has the power of governing the Churches of the whole world.*

Tenthly. Sozomenus in book 3, chapter 7 said: *As the care for all was fitting to the dignity of his See, he restored them all to their own Churches.* Here he is speaking about Julius I, who returned the episcopacy to Athanasius in Alexandria, and Paul in Constantinople.

Eleventhly. Acacius in a letter to Pope Simplicius, which is contained in Tome 2 of the Councils, said: *Bearing the solicitude of all the Churches, according to the Apostle, you often exhort us, although we willingly watch and excel in what we do.*

In the twelfth place. This concerns the bishop of Patara, about whom Liberatus writes in chapter 22 of the Breviarium: *When Sylverius came to Patara, the venerable bishop of the city went to the Emperor and contested the judgment of God concerning the expulsion of the bishop of such a See; he also said there are many kings in this world, but that there is not one like the Pope over the Church of the whole world.*

CHAPTER XVI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE LATIN FATHERS

Furthermore, among the Latins blessed Cyprian often teaches this same thing. But before we quote the pertinent places, it is necessary to give a brief explanation of the argument of his book on the unity of the Church; for, based on that, his other testimonies will be more easily understood. Therefore, by his book on the unity of the Church he set out to show in what the unity of the Church consists, and first of all he demonstrates the source from which division and heresy arise: *This takes place,* he *sz\à, from the fact that when there is no return to the origin of the truth, the head is not sought and the doctrine of the heavenly teacher is not preserved.*

There he proposes three things. First, the origin of the truth concerning the Church, that is, whence does the teaching of the Church have its beginning. Second, the head of the Church, which is different from Christ; for, a little before he had said that all heretics seek Christ, and still he says here that all heresies have their origin because the heretics do not seek the head of the Church. Third, the doctrine of the heavenly teacher, that is, what is the doctrine of Christ on the Church and her head.

Having made these proposals, he immediately explains the three, saying: *The Lord says to Peter: I tell you, you are Peter, and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and to the same one after his resurrection he says: Feed my sheep, etc.* There Cyprian teaches the origin of the truth of the Church, which he said must be sought in these words of the Lord. For here is the beginning of the teaching of the Church; and similarly the head of the Church, which he said must be sought in Peter; and these words contain the doctrine of the heavenly teacher. Therefore shortly thereafter he adds and teaches that the Church is one in its source and head, although it is multiplied by propagation, and he gives three examples of light, fountain and tree, all of which are one in their source, and are multiplied by propagation. Therefore we learn from this text that Peter is the head of the whole Church.

But that this same truth pertains also to the Roman Pontiff, Cyprian declares in book 1, letter 3 to Cornelius, where he is speaking about the heresy of the Novatians, who did not acknowledge that Cornelius was the pontiff. So he said this: *For heresies do not have any other source, nor are schisms given birth, except from the fact that there is no submission to the priest of God; in the Church there is one priest and one judge as the vicar of Christ. If the whole fraternity would be subject to him according to the divine teachings, no one would propose anything against the college of priests.*

Some adversaries respond that Cyprian here is speaking about individual bishops, and particular Churches, and that he wants to say in each Church there should be at the same time one judge and priest. But if this text is compared with what preceded it, it will be apparent that Cyprian clearly is speaking about the whole Church. For, as he had said there that heresies arise from the fact that the head is not sought and he explained that the head of the whole Church is Peter. Thus here he says that heresies come from the fact that one judge in the Church as the vicar of Christ is not accepted, namely Cornelius, for

it is about him that he is speaking. Wherefore a little later in the same letter he calls the Roman Church the See of Peter, and the principal Church, from which the priestly unity has its origin.

The same author in book 2, letter 40 to Cornelius said: *Let us take pity on our recent colleagues, that they return from their separation to the unity of the Catholic Church; however, the obstinate and inflexible pertinacity of the separated brothers not only refused to return to the bosom and embrace of the root and mother, but also established an adulterous and opposed head outside the Church, etc.* Here he is speaking openly about the Catholic Church, outside of which are the Novatians. But Cyprian says not only that the Novatians did not want to return to the Church, and acknowledge the root and mother or head of this Church, but also that they constituted for themselves an adulterous and opposed head. Therefore just as Novatian was the head of all the Novatianists, so Cornelius was the head of all the Catholics.

Cyprian also in book 1, letter 8 wrote to all the people: *God is one, and Christ is one, and there is one Church, and one Chair founded on Peter by the word of the Lord. Another altar cannot be established, nor can there be a new priesthood, besides the one altar and the one priesthood. Whoever gathers together elsewhere, scatters.*

Here surely as there is one God and one Christ, and only one Church, so there is only one Chair, that is, one singular Chair which teaches the whole Church, and it is that of Peter, outside of whom whoever gathers, scatters. Finally, in book 4, letter 8 he again calls the Roman Church the root and mother of the Catholic Church.

But the adversaries object. First, they cite the book of Cyprian on the unity of the Church where he says this: *There is one episcopacy, a part of which is held firmly by each bishop.* Therefore, there is not one bishop of the whole Church. Secondly, they raise an objection from the letter of Cyprian to Quintus, where Cyprian sitting in a Council says: *For no one of our bishops constituted himself to be a bishop, or compels his colleagues with tyrannical threats to be subject to him, when every bishop has his own choice regarding the use of his freedom and power, since he cannot be judged by another nor can he judge any other bishop. But let us wait for the universal judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has the power to put us in charge of the government of his Church and to judge our actions.*

I respond to the first objection: the episcopacy is one in the same way in which the Church is one: but the Church is one in the way in which the many branches of a tree are one, many streams are one river, and many rays are one light, as Cyprian says in the same place. Therefore as in branches, streams and rays there is unity by reason of the one head, that is, of the root, of the fountain, of the sun, although the branches, streams and rays themselves are multiplied, so also the Church is one, and the episcopacy is one in its root and head, although there are many particular Churches, many particular episcopacies. Therefore, a part of the one great episcopacy is firmly held by the individual bishops, but not equally nor in the same way. For, Peter and his successors hold that part which is like the head, and root and fountain; the others hold other parts which are like the branches and the streams.

For this one episcopacy (as we have said) is like a heterogeneous, not a homogenous

body; from this it follows that the individual bishops do not hold a part of this episcopacy in the same way. For, as the root, although it is a part, just as also the branch is a part, supports and governs the branches, and all the things in the branches are also virtually in the root, not vice versa. So also although the Roman Church and the Roman episcopacy are part of the universal Church, and of the universal episcopacy, as is the Tusculan Church and its episcopacy, nevertheless the Roman Church governs the Tusculan, and not vice versa.

Therefore, from the opinion of Cyprian it is rightly concluded that the Roman Pope is not the only bishop of all the Churches, because there are other real bishops who have received their own part of the whole Church to rule. However, it is not rightly concluded that the Roman pontiff is not the head and pastor of all the bishops, and therefore also of the whole Church, since the part that has been assigned to him to rule has the same place in the Church that the root has in the tree, the head in the body, and the fountain in the streams of a river.

To the second objection I say that Cyprian, when he says, *no one makes himself the bishop of bishops,* is talking about those who were in the Council of Carthage, and that the Roman pontiff was not included in that opinion, who really is the bishop of bishops, and the father of fathers, as we shall show below when we consider the various titles.

Concerning what he says about a bishop not being able to be judged except by God, since he is constituted by God alone, I say: this must be understood to be about doubtful and hidden things. For, it is explained in this way by St. Augustine in book 3, chapter 3 of his treatise on Baptism, and he says this about Cyprian's words: *This is my opinion in these questions, which have not yet been discussed with a clear analysis, etc.*

There he is teaching that Cyprian wants to signify that the individual bishops in the Council, while the matter is being discussed, can freely express their own opinion, and should not be forced unfairly to embrace the opinion of the présider, before the matter has been defined. For, that in other respects the pontiff could judge and depose heretical bishops, or manifest schismatics, is clear from book 2, letter 13 to Pope Stephen, where Cyprian exhorts him to order the deposition of bishop of Arles, and to appoint another in his place.

Secondly, Optatus follows the opinion of Cyprian about the unique Chair of the whole Church in book 3 against Parmenides, where he says that there are five endowments of the Catholic Church, and the first is the unique and singular Chair of Peter, in which unity must be observed by all. And he shows that this unique Chair pertains not only to Peter, but also to his successors by enumerating all the Roman pontiffs until Siricius. And finally he concludes: *Therefore concerning the above-mentioned endowments the Chair is the first, which we have proved by Peter to be ours.*

Thirdly, St. Ambrose in comments on 1 Tim. 3 said: *Since the whole world belongs to God, still his house is said to be the Church, whose ruler today is Damasus.*

The same saint in his prayer for Satyrus said: *A bishop is good if he agrees with the Catholic bishops, that is, if he is in union with the Roman Church.*

Why, I ask, are bishops not Catholic if they do not agree with the Roman Church, unless it is because the Roman Church is the head of the Catholic Church? Ambrose

also said in book 3, chapter 1 on the Sacraments: *We are not ignorant of the fact that the Roman Church does not have this custom, and we follow her lead and direction in all things.* And after that he said: *I want to follow the Roman Church in all things, but we men also have our own sense of things; therefore what is done correctly elsewhere, we also do the same thing.*

Here it should be observed: when Ambrose says that he wants to follow the Roman Church in all things, and still does not want to follow her in this custom of not washing the feet of those recently baptized, that phrase "in all things" should be understood to be about all necessary things and things pertaining to salvation; otherwise he would be contradicting himself.

Fourthly, St. Jerome in a letter to Agemchias on monogamy said: *Many years ago when I was helping Damasus, bishop of the city of Rome, with the writing of ecclesiastical letters, I would respond to the synodical consultations of both East and West, etc.* Do you see how from the whole Church and from the whole world answers were sought then from the apostolic See? Likewise he said in a letter to Damasus on the word "hypostasis": *Although your greatness frightens me, still your humanity invites me to seek from my shepherd the protection of a sheep. I am speaking with the successor of the fisherman and the disciple of the cross. Following no one else but Christ, I am united with your beatitude, that is, in communion with the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is built upon that rock. Whoever eats the lamb outside of this house is godless. If anyone is not in the ark of Noah, he will perish in the raging flood.* And after that: *I do not know Vitalis, I reject Meletius, I do not know Paulinus. Whoever does not gather with you, scatters, that is, he who is not of Christ is of the Antichrist.*

Notice first of all that Jerome, who was an Antiochene priest, still says that he is a sheep of the Roman bishop.

Secondly, note that Jerome confesses that Damasus is the successor of Peter.

Thirdly, note that he says: *Following no one else but Christ, I am united in communion with your beatitude;* so he is saying that he adheres first to Christ, and then to the vicar of Christ. This is the same as if he said: *I put no one before you, pontiff Damasus, except Christ.*

Fourthly, it is affirmed by Jerome that the See of the Roman pontiff is the foundation of his house and the ship, which is the universal Church, and therefore that the Roman pontiff is the head of the whole Church.

Wherefore even Erasmus himself, who in other respects usually is more hostile to the Roman Church, in his Annotations on this passage says that it seems to him that Jerome with these words is saying that all the Churches are subject to the apostolic See. This should be kept in mind concerning the new heretics, who consider Erasmus their oracle.

But Calvin objects. First of all, Jerome in his letter to Nepotianus where, in recalling examples of unity, Jerome says: *The individual bishops of the Churches, the individual archpriests, the individual archdeacons and every ecclesiastical order depend on their own leaders. And he does not add,* Calvin said, *that all the Churches are held together among themselves by one head as the bond.*

Secondly, an objection is raised not only by Calvin, but also by Illyricus, Melanchthon

and others from the letter to Evagrius, where Jerome says: *If authority is sought, the world is larger than the city. Why do you hold up to me the custom of one city? Why do you vindicate the scarcity, out of which came arrogance in the laws of the Church? Wherever there was a bishop, whether of Rome, or of Eugubius, or of Constantinople, or of Regium, or of Alexandria, or of Tanis, they all have the same merit and the same priesthood. The power of riches, and the humility of poverty do not make a bishop greater or inferior.*

To the first objection I say that Jerome did not omit the one head, for since he says, *every ecclesiastical order depends on its leaders,* he is indicating that besides one bishop, one archpriest, and one archdeacon, there are still other unities, namely, in each province there is one metropolitan; in the individual major regions there is one primate; in the whole Church there is one pontiff. Otherwise, it will not be true that in every ecclesiastical order there is one ruler.

To the second objection I say that Jerome in that place is reprimanding a certain bad custom, which was in Rome, not in the whole Roman Church, or in the Sovereign Pontiff, but only in the Roman deacons. For since there were only a few deacons, and they had the care of the Church treasury, gradually they began to put themselves before the priests, and to sit among them, since the ancient custom was that the priests would sit with the bishop, while the deacons remained standing, not sitting. Therefore it is about this that he says: *Why do you hold up to me the custom of one city? Why do you vindicate the scarcity, out of which came the arrogance?*

But that the Roman Pontiff did not approve that custom is affirmed by Jerome in the same place. For he says that only when the bishop was absent did the deacons dare to sit among the priests. But when Jerome says that the bishops have "the same merit and priesthood," this is true, but it is to be understood about the episcopacy under the aspect of orders, not jurisdiction. For, Jerome did not want to deny that the authority of the bishop of Alexandria was greater than that of the bishop of Tanis, since it is certain that the former presided over three provinces, while the latter was over only one small city.

Fifthly: St. Augustine in letter 162 said: *In the Roman Church the primacy of the apostolic See was always flourishing.* Likewise in letter 92 to Pope Innocent: *Because the Lord by a special gift of his grace has placed you in the apostolic See, and made it such in our times, that it would redound more to a fault of negligence, if with regard to your veneration, which has been advised for the Church, we were to remain silent; you can either accept it or reject it, but now we ask that you deign to use pastoral diligence towards the great dangers of the weak members of Christ.*

With these words Augustine, with the whole Council of Mileum, is asking that Innocent exercise his pastoral care of the Church to stop the Pelagians, who were corrupting especially Palestine and Africa. Certainly he could not do this, unless he believed that Innocent was the pastor also of Palestine and Africa. Then, why does Augustine not write to the patriarch of Jerusalem, or to the metropolitan of Palestine, or to the bishop primate of Carthaginian Africa, rather than to the Roman Pontiff, unless because he knew that the authority of the Roman Pontiff was greater in Palestine and Africa than was that of their own bishops?

Likewise in letter 157 to Optatus he said: *While I was present in Caesarea they came where ecclesiastical necessity drew us because of a command given to us by the venerable Pope Zozimus, the bishop of the apostolic See.* Indeed, Zozimus had commanded that the bishops of Africa should be assembled at the Council of Caesarea, and St. Augustine thought that he should obey, and necessarily obey Pope Zozimus. Likewise in book 1, chapter 1 to Boniface: *You are not proud and you do not disdain to be a friend of the humble, even though you preside in a lofty place.* And after that he said: *It is common for all of us, who fulfill the office of the episcopacy, although he excels in it at a more lofty height, being the pastoral watch-tower.* You can see here from Augustine that all the bishops are subject to the preeminence of the Roman Pontiff.

Sixthly. St. Prosper in the book on ingratitude said: *Rome is the See of Peter, which was made the head of pastoral honor for the world; whatever it does not possess by force of arms, it holds by religion, etc.* And in book 2, chapter 6 on the vocation of the Gentiles: *Rome,* he said, *by the primacy of the priesthood became more esteemed in the field of religion that the royal seat of power.*

Seventhly. Blessed Victor Uticensis in book 2 on persecution calls the Roman Church the head of all the Churches.

Eighthly. Vincent of Lérins in chapter 30 of his Commonitory said: *There were read in the Council certain Epistles of St. Felix, martyr, and St. Julius, both bishops of Rome. And that not only the head of the world, but the other parts also might bear witness to the judgment of the council, there was added from the South the most blessed Cyprian, bishop of Carthage and martyr, and from the North St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan.* You see that the Roman Pontiff is called the head of the world.

Ninthly. Cassiodorus in book 11, chapter 2 to Pope John said: *You preside as watchmen for the Christian people, you love all in the name of the Father.* And after that: *Therefore it is fitting that we watch over some* (for Cassiodorus had been asked by king Theodoric to care for the city of Rome), *but you care for all.*

Tenthly. Bede in book 2, chapter 1 of his history of the English people said: *Since from the first he* (Gregoiy) *functioned as pontifff for the whole world, and he was the prelate for the Church converted a long time ago to the faith of truth; having freed our people from idols, he made it the Church of Christ.*

In the eleventh place: St. Anselm, in chapter 1 of his book on the Incarnation of the Word, dedicated the book to Pope Urban with these words: *To the Lord and Father of the whole Church sojourning on earth, to the Sovereign Pontiff Urban, your brother Anselm, in life a sinner, in habit a monk, either at the command or the permission of God called the metropolitan bishop of Canterbury, I offer my due submission with humble service and devout prayers. Since divine providence has chosen your holiness with the task of guarding Christian life and faith, and committed the Church into your hands, if something contrary to the Catholic faith occurs in the Church it is to be rightly referred to no one else but you, so that by your authority it may be corrected; and what response should be given to error I know to be done by you more safely than by anyone else.*

In the twelfth place: Hugo of St. Victor, in book 2, chapter 15 of his book on the Sacraments said: *The apostolic See takes precedence over all the Churches in the world.*

In the thirteenth place: St. Bernard (whom Calvin also cites in his own favor, and he calls him a holy man in book 4, chapter 7 § 22) in book 2 on Consideration said: *Now let us examine more carefully who you are, what role you have in the Church at the present time. Who are you? You are a great priest, the Sovereign Pontiff, you are the ruler of the bishops, you are the heir of the Apostles; in primacy you are Abel, in steering Noah, in patriarchy Abraham, in orders Melchizedek, in dignity Aaron, in authority Moses, in judging Samuel, in power Peter, in anointing Christ. You are the one to whom the keys were given, the sheep were entrusted; surely there are other door-keepers of heaven, and pastors of flocks, but you are as much more glorious than the others as you are more different from them because of the name you have inherited.*

They have flocks assigned to them, each bishop his own flock, but all have been entrusted to you—one flock to one shepherd. And you are the one shepherd not only of all the sheep, but also of all the shepherds. And after that: *Therefore according to your canons, others care for a part, but you have been given the fullness of power. The power of the others is curtailed by certain limits; yours extends over those who have received power over others. Is it not true that if there is a good reason, you can exclude a bishop from heaven, you can depose him from his episcopate, and also hand him over to Satan? Therefore your privilege remains firmly in your hands, both in the keys given to you and in the sheep entrusted to you.*

This is what he says, being a holy man according to Calvin, and without Calvi proven by innumerable miracles. But there cannot be true sanctity without the true faitt therefore with the true faith St. Bernard believed that the Roman Pontiff is the shepherd of the whole Church.

But Calvin raises many objections based on what the same Bernard wrote against the abuses and vices of the Roman Curia in his book on Consideration, namely, by saying that from the whole world ambitious, greedy, simoniacal men travel to Rome, who want to be raised to ecclesiastical honors by the apostolic authority. But these charges do not need a solution; for, as the same St. Bernard teaches expressly in sermon 66 on the Song of Songs, the bad morals of prelates does not prevent them from being prelates, and we are bound to obey them, since the Lord says in Matt. 23:3: *Observe whatever they tell you, but do not do what they do.*

Finally, there is the testimony of a Latin Emperor, similar to the report we gave above concerning a Greek Emperor. Valentinianus in a letter to Theodosius, which exists among the preambles to the Council of Chalcedon, said: *We must preserve the dignity of proper veneration for the blessed apostle Peter in our times, inasmuch as the blessed bishop of the Roman city, on whom the primacy of the priesthood over all was conferred long ago, possesses the place and the authority of judging priests.*

Similar things are contained in the letters of Galla Placida, and of Licinia Eudoxia Augusta to the same Theodosius in the same place.

CHAPTER XVII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE ORIGIN AND ANTIQUITY OF THE PRIMACY

So far we have shown from divine law, from the general Councils, from the testimonies of holy pontiffs, from the consensus of the Greek and Latin Fathers that the ecclesiastical primacy of the Roman Pontiffs has taken its beginning from the resurrection of Christ, and Christ himself being its author. This type of argument is usually said to be demonstrative; now, in order to prove the same thing, we will begin to use another type of argument, which is called one that leads to the impossible. For if the primacy does not exist, as we say it does, then the ecclesiastical primacy of the Roman Pontiff began at another time and it had another author. But no time can be assigned, no author can be cited without our being able to demonstrate that this primacy is not as old as ours, unless it comes from Christ as the author and at the time of Christ; therefore it is necessary for us to arrive at this conclusion.

The adversaries respond that they can assign a time and an author. In fact, John of Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 39 in his Summa on the Church cites four opinions of the heretics.

First, there is that of those who say that the authority of the Roman Pontiffs is from the Apostles.

Second, some say it is from a general Council—Nilus follows this opinion.

Third, some say it comes from the Cardinal Electors; the little Smalkaldic book on the primacy also teaches this, or at least something similar. Hence they try to prove that the Pope is not over the Church by divine right, because the Church elected the Pope.

Fourth, some say that it was introduced by the Emperors; many heretics have embraced this last opinion. Therefore we will consider each one briefly.

The first opinion has three testimonies in its favor. One is that of Anacletus in letter 2 where he says: *The other apostles received power and honor together with him* (Peter) *on an equal level, and they wanted him to be their leader.*

The second one is that of Julius I in letter 1, where he is speaking about the apostles: *They wanted,* he said, *the holy Roman Church to have primacy over all the Churches.* The third one is from the canon, *Ego Ludovicus,* distinction 63, where the Roman Pontiff is said to be the vicar of blessed Peter. From this it seems to follow that not Christ, but Peter gave the authority to the Roman Pontiff.

Now this opinion is refuted easily. For, the same Anacletus in letter 3 says this: *The holy Roman Church received the primacy not from the Apostles, but from the Lord himself and our Savior, as he said to blessed Peter: You are Peter, etc.*

Therefore since the same author writes that the Apostles wanted Peter to be their leader, he is not speaking about an instituting will, but about the approval and acknowledgement of what the Lord had established; Pope Julius seems also to have said the same thing. Although it is also possible to give a different response to the testimony of Julius, namely, that Peter had the primacy from Christ alone, nevertheless, the Roman Church about which Julius is speaking there had it in another way from the Apostles.

For (as we said above) the Roman Pontiff, since he is the successor of Peter, has the primacy from Christ. However, the reason for the succession comes from the fact of Peter. Therefore, St. Gregory in book 6, letter 37 to Eulogius said: *He elevated the Chair, in which he also deigned to rest and to finish this present life.*

But that the word "vicar" is found does not cause a difficulty. For, if in one place the Roman Pontiff is called the vicar of Peter, in six hundred places he is called his "successor," as is evident from the testimonies cited above. In addition, the vicar of Peter is said to be the sovereign pontiff, because St. Peter lived there and did not abandon the government of the Church, as Leo says in sermon 2 on the anniversary of his becoming pope. But because Peter does not properly function in the pastoral office, but by his merits and prayers rules and protects the Church, those ways of speaking are improper, and sometimes are used only out of reverence for blessed Peter. Therefore St. Leo, in the place cited, says that he is the heir of blessed Peter.

The second opinion, which says that the primacy was instituted by the Councils, is proved by Nilus with two arguments. The first one is in the Council of Chalcedon, in canon 28 (as he quotes it) or in session 16 in our codex: for there the Council says that the Roman Church had the primacy from the Fathers, because that city at that time possessed the empire over the world.

The second argument is the New Constitution 100 of Justinian, which however is number 131 for us, where we read this: *We decree according to the decrees of the sacred synods that the holy bishop of ancient Rome is the first among all the priests.* These reasons of Nilus can be confirmed from Council IV under Symmachus, where we read this: *Then the authority of the venerable Councils gave a singular power over all the Churches to the apostolic See because of the merit of blessed Peter.* Illyricus in his book against the primacy and in the history of the primacy proves this same opinion in four places by the testimony of letter 301 (as he cites it, but it really is 288) of Aeneas Sylvius, who later was named Pius II. Accordingly, in that letter Aeneas says this: *Before the Council of Nicaea each one lived in his own way, and little respect was had towards the Roman Church.*

But these arguments can be refuted easily. And that the Roman Pontiff has the primacy not from the Councils, but from Christ, besides the many arguments already given for this, is affirmed by Gelasius in the Council of 70 bishops with these words: *The holy Roman Church was not placed over the other Churches by the decrees of any synods, but he obtained the primacy by the evangelical voice of our Lord and Savior.*

Therefore I respond to the first argument of Nilus: that decree is indeed from a great Council, but it was not passed legitimately; therefore it has no validity or authority. For, it is certain from session 16 of the same Council that that decree was enacted while the legates of the apostolic See were absent, who presided over the Council. Likewise it is certain that the same legates afterwards openly rejected that decree. Synod 7 bears witness (which Nilus in the same place accepts) in session 6, not to mention other testimonies that I pass over for now, that a decree of a general Council, which is passed without the approval of the Roman Pontiff or his legate, is not legitimate. Not only did the legates of St. Leo reject that decree in the synod itself, but also St. Leo himself, who confirmed the

other decrees of the Council, condemned that particular one, and rejected it in letter 51 to Anatolius, and also to Martianus, to Pulcheria, to Maxima, to Juvenal.

Why is this so? – because in that decree there are two things manifestly false. The first is that the primacy was given to the Roman Pontiff by the Nicene Fathers. For, the Council of Nicaea did not attribute the primacy to the Roman Pontiff as if beforehand he did not have it, but it acknowledged that he has it and always did have it. For, canon 6 of the Nicene Council begins like this (and it is repeated in session 16 of the same Council of Chalcedon): *The Roman Church always had the primacy.* Then, if before the Council of Nicaea the Pope did not have the primacy, by what right was Dionysius, the patriarch of Alexandria, about 60 years before the Council of Nicaea, accused before the Roman Pontiff Dionysius? And why did the Roman Pontiff not deny that he was the judge, and the bishop of Alexandria did not reject his judgment, since however both were holy men? But that this is what happened, Athanasius writes in his book on the opinion of Dionysius of Alexandria. Finally, there is not one word in the whole Council of Nicaea, whereby some new power is conferred on the Roman Pontiff, as we have shown sufficiently above.

Secondly, what is asserted in the decree is not less false, that is, the reason why the Fathers conceded the primacy to the Roman city was because the city was the seat of the Empire. For, that is refuted with clear words by St. Leo in letter 52 to Martianus and by St. Gelasius in his bishop to the bishop of the Dardanelles and the reason is manifest. For, as Gelasius rightly pointed out, Milan also, and Ravenna, and Sirmium, and Treves, and Nicomedia were often seats of the Empire, but the Fathers did not confer any primacy on their bishops. Therefore it remains that all the Fathers teach with a common consensus that the Roman See is the first See because it was the See of the prince of the Apostles. And certainly this could not be conferred by the presence of the Emperor, nor removed by his absence.

To the second argument I respond that the canons of the Councils in a certain sense attributed authority to the Roman Church, because they declared it and recognized it; just as also the Nicene Council is said to have defined that the Son of God is consubstantial with the Father. Hence John II in a letter to Justinian, after he had said that the Roman Church is the head of the Church, then he added: *As the rules and statutes of the Fathers declare.* And Nicolaus I in a letter to the Emperor Michael said: *These privileges were conferred on this holy Church by Christ, and they were not granted by Councils, but celebrated and honored, etc.*

And in the fourth Synod under Symmachus three reasons are given, if someone carefully takes note of it, for the primacy of the Roman Church. For we read this: *When he was Pope,* that is, Symmachus, *following the command of the Lord the authority of the venerable Councils gave a singular power over all the Churches to the apostolic See because of the merit of blessed Peter.*

There first of all the merit of Peter is mentioned, because Peter obtained the primacy on account of the merit of his confession (Matt. 16:16). Secondly, he is appointed by a command of the Lord, whereby the primacy is established and conferred on Peter, since it was said to him: *Feed my sheep* (John 21). Thirdly, the authority of the Councils is mentioned, which declared this command of the Lord.

It is easy to respond to Illyricus. For, Aeneas Sylvius in that letter wanted to demonstrate nothing other than that the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was instituted by Christ. For, his letter to Martin Mayer begins in this way: *There are some men in your nation, not being serious thinkers, for whom the authority of the Roman Pontiff does not seem to be necessary, nor to have been instituted by Christ. We have decided to write this letter against them, and to send it to you, so that if ever such men approach you, you will have from us a sword with which you can confound their temerity.*

Therefore when he says later that before the Nicene Council each one lived for himself, and had little respect for the Roman Church, this means nothing other than that, because of the continuous persecutions, the Roman Pontiffs could not exercise the authority they had received from Christ; and that on this account that the other bishops were forced to live by themselves, and not to look for much help from the Roman Church. This opinion of Aeneas Sylvius partly is true, and partly is not true.

For it is true that the authority of the Pontiff was greatly limited at that time, as is clear from the persecutions, which were raging at that time; but it is not true that very little respect was had for the Roman Church, as the examples will make clear, which we will cite below.

The third opinion has almost no foundation. For, it is certain that there were pontiffs before there were any cardinals, and that at least some true pontiffs were not created by the cardinals. Certainly Christ, not the cardinals, made Peter the pontiff, and Peter, not the cardinals, chose Clement. Furthermore, if the cardinals confer power on the pontiff, then they can take it away; but by the consent of all this is false, for it is not the cardinals but a general Council that deposes a doubtful pontiff.

But you will say: whatever the case may be with the cardinals, it is certain that the Roman Pontiff is elected and created by men; therefore he receives his power from them.

However, that the Sovereign Pontiff is truly and really appointed by men is testified to by the decree of the election of Gregory VII, which is found in his life in Platina in these words: *We cardinals of the holy Roman Church, clerics, acolytes, subdeacons, priests, present bishops, abbots, and many others, both of the ecclesiastical and lay order, today elect X on the calends of May, in the Basilica of St. Peter in Chains, in the year of salvation 1073, to be the true vicar of Christ, the Archdeacon Hildebrand, a man of great learning, of great piety, prudence, justice, constancy, modest in religion, sober, continent, governing his own home, hospitable to the poor, educated in the womb of holy mother Church from his tender years until his present age; we want him to preside over the Church of God with the same power which Peter long ago exercised at the command of God.*

From this two things seem to be able to be deduced. One is that the pontiff is not over the Church, but he is a subject of the Church, since the Church makes the Pope, the Pope does not make the Church; this is a consequence of the Smalkaldic synod as contained in the book against the primacy. The other is that the pontiff by human right, not by divine, possesses all the power he has. But the first consequence is not valid, for also the electors of the empire create the emperor, and the people create the king, and nevertheless the emperor is above the electors, and the king is above the people. The second reason is

also not valid.

For it is to be observed that in the pontiff there are three things: *The pontificate itself,* which is a certain form: *the person,* who is the subject of the pontificate: *and the joining* of the one with the other. Of these things the first, that is, the pontificate, is from Christ only; but the person is from his natural causes absolutely, but as a person elected and designated for the pontificate he is from the electors, whose task it is to designate the person. But the joining together is from Christ, by the mediating human act of the electors; for, when they elect and designate a certain person, they agree on the joining together of the pontificate with that person.

Therefore, the electors truly are said to create the pontiff and to be the reason why this man is the pontiff, and that he should have its power; however, they do not give that power to him, nor are they the cause of that power. As in the generation of a man, since the soul is infused only by God, and still the generating father, by disposing the matter, is the cause of the joining of the soul with the body. So man is said to generate a man, and still he is not said to produce the soul of a man. Moreover, those words of the electors: *We want him to preside with the same power, etc.* only declare and express the completed election of a man to be the successor of Peter.

The fourth opinion is that of many heretics, who however do not agree with each other. For, Marsilius of Padua, and afterwards John Wycliffe and John Hus, who said the pontiff received his power from Caesar, seem to have understood under the name of "Caesar" Constantine the Great, because of the canon which begins with the word "Constantine," in distinction 96, where Constantine decreed that the Roman Pontiff is to be considered to be in the same place by all priests in which the king is held by the lower judges of the whole kingdom. For more on the opinion of these men, see John of Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 42, and book 4, the last two chapters.

John Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 17 says that the primacy was given to the pontiffs among the Greeks by the Emperor Photius, but among the Gauls and Germans first by Pepin and then by Charlemagne, the kings of the Franks.

Luther in his book on the power of the pope says that Constantine IV was the one who gave the primacy to the pontiff, and to prove this he cites Platina in the life of Benedict II. But the same Luther in a book on the reckoning of the times teaches that the primacy of the Pope was introduced by Photius. The same thing is said by the Centuriatorians in Centuries 6, chapter 1, by Illyricus in the history of the first Smalkaldic book on the primacy of the Pope, by Theodore Bibliander in Chronicles 11, and by many others.

All of these claims can be easily refuted, and first of all the first opinion is not opposed to us. For, Constantine the Great donated his Lateran Palace and many other temporal things to the Sovereign Pontiff; but he did not give him any spiritual power, and he could not give it. For, in the same canon Constantine confesses that blessed Peter was the vicar of Christ, and therefore that his successors must be held as the princes and heads of the whole Church. Therefore he only declared an ancient right, and he enhanced the pontiff with many additional temporal gifts.

You can add to this that the Lutherans and Calvinists contend that that canon is a fake; therefore at this time there is no dispute between us and the heretics concerning the

edict of Constantine with regard to spiritual jurisdiction, because they admit that it did not begin with Constantine.

In addition, the opinion of Luther is based on a false foundation; for Platina did not say that Constantine IV gave the primacy to the pontiff, but that he renounced the right which he had, or thought he had, of confirming the pontiff. For, the predecessors of Constantine IV from the time of Justinian, who had freed the city from the Goths, were accustomed not to permit the election of a new pontiff, unless he was confirmed by himself; and the pontiffs tolerated this for the good of the Church, because they saw that they could not carry out their office against the will of the Emperor; this is something that Gregoiy could understand.

For, in the explanation of the fourth penitential Psalm he strongly denounced the temerity of emperors, who usurped for themselves this right over the Roman Church.

However, the same St. Gregory, as Deacon John writes in book 1, chapter 40 of the life of St. Gregory, when he was elected pontiff by the clergy and people, wrote in secret to the emperor beseeching him that in no way should he consent. But the prefect of the city, having learned about this, sent some men to seize the message of Gregoiy as it was on its way, and to destroy it—which is what they did. And he sent some other messengers to inform the emperor of the election by the clergy and people and to seek his confirmation.

Therefore Platina writes that Constantine IV, deeply impressed by the holiness of Benedict II, sent to him his approval, whereby he commanded that the one whom th clergy and people had elected should be acknowledged immediately as the true vicar c Christ, without waiting for any approval from the emperor. Therefore, the sanction o! Constantine IV did not concern the power of the Pope, as Luther thought but concerned only the election.

To the point about Photius, I respond that Photius published a sanction whereby he declared that the Roman Church is the head of all the Churches, as Bede says in the book on the six ages of Photius, and Ado in the Chronicle, and the Deacon Paul in book 18 on the republic of Rome. But it was not on account of this that the primacy was introduced by Photius. For Photius sanctioned it by declaring and asserting it, not by instituting something new; this can be proved with a certain argument.

For, Gregory in book 7, letter 63 to John, Bishop of Syracuse said: *Concerning the See of Constantinople, who doubts that it is subject to the apostolic See? This is something that the pious lordly Emperor, and my brother Eusebius, bishop of the same city, faithfully profess.* But the letter was written about five years before the rule of Photius, as is clearly gathered from the number in the address.

Then Justinian Senior, who lived 70 years before Photius, in a letter to John II says that the Roman Church is the head of all the Churches; and Valentinian, who preceded Photius by 140 years, in a letter to Theodotius says that the Roman Pontiff always had the primacy of the priesthood over all. And this is proved by the testimonies of Irenaeus, Athanasius, Cyril, Theodoretus, Sozomenus, and of the other Greeks whom we cited above.

But the reason why Photius thought that such a certain thing should again be sanctioned

by his law was the pride of the bishops of Constantinople, as Bede, Ado and Deacon Paul mention in the place cited. For, since they wrote that they were the universal patriarchs and the first of all the bishops, against all divine law and right, and the excommunications which the Roman Pontiffs, Pelagius and Gregory, brought against them were not able to break their obstinacy, it seemed good to the Emperor that he himself, whom the Greeks greatly feared, should intervene. Therefore, he declared that the Roman Church is the head of all the Churches and therefore that the bishop of Constantinople was not the universal bishop, but a particular one and subject to the apostolic See.

Concerning Pepin, I respond that Calvin, by means of an astonishing artifice, has advocated a certain true history distorted by two lies in favor of his own heresy. For, what he says—that with the help of the pontiffs Pepin obtained the kingdom of the Franks and Charlemagne the empire of the Romans, is true, and is confirmed by many historical writings. But what he says—that unjustly and wickedly the true king of the Franks was deprived of his kingdom by the pontiff Zachary and by Pepin—is false and insulting not only to the pontiff, but also to the kings of Gaul and to the emperors of Germany, because both of them descend from Pepin. But what he adds, namely, on this account that the primacy in Gaul and Germany was conceded to the pontiff by Pepin and Charlemagne, and like robbers they divided up the spoils, so that the temporal rule was given to Pepin and Charlemagne and the primacy of the priesthood to the pontiffs—this is not only false, but also contrary to the previous lie; for those lies contradict each other, so that one cancels out the other.

First of all, that Zachary justly and legitimately deposed king Childeric, and ordered that Pepin should replace him, is affirmed by all those who have written about this, both Greeks and Latins, with the exception of the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 8, chapter 10 on the life of Zachary, and Calvin in the place cited. For, it is reported by Eginhardus in the life of Charlemagne, Aimonius in book 4, chapter 61 on the history of the Franks, Cedrenus in the life of Leo Isaurus, Deacon Paul in book 6, chapter 5 on the history of the Longobards, Blondus in book 10, chapter 1, Rhegino in book 2 of the Chronicles, Marianus Scotus in book 3 of the Chronology, Otto Frisingensis in book 5 of his history, Ado of Vienne in the Chronical, age 6, Abbas Urspergensis in the Chronicle, Sigbertus in the Chronicle and Paul Aemilius in books 1 and 2 on the history of the Franks shortly before the time of Pepin—all of these say that the kings of the Franks had degenerated after their predecessors, that the management of the kingdom had been transferred to the knights and courtiers, and they showed themselves to the people only once a year on May 1; all the rest of the time they gave themselves up to entertainment and pleasures. And because of this, by the agreement of all the nobles, they asked the Sovereign Pontiff to permit them to transfer the rule of the kingdom to those who truly and really were kings, and would take good care immediately of the affairs of the kingdom. This surely was a just request; for, because of those evils Gaul had come into bad repute among all the nations, and also the kingdom was filled with innumerable dissensions.

Not only did those kings (as these authors say) not take care of the affairs of the kingdom, but also because of their inertia religion in Gaul was so little encouraged that it was almost extinct, as is clear from the letter of St. Boniface of Mainz to the Roman

Pontiff, Zachary. There he says that for almost 80 years in France, while those kings were reigning, no synod had been assembled, episcopal Churches were controlled by lay people, clerics had four or five concubines at the same time, and finally all religion was despised and abandoned.

Therefore when Zachary understood that for many years the kings of the Franks were kings in title only, and that Childeric, who was now reigning, not only like his elders did not rule the kingdom, but also was totally lacking in ability and truly was said to be and was stupid, and at the same time when he saw that the kingdom and religion in Gaul were being destroyed, and all the nobles of the kingdom wanted Pepin to be king, finally, as the one who was responsible for the salvation of all, he judged that it was permissible for the Franks to transfer the kingdom of Childeric to Pepin, and in the process he absolved from their oath those who had pledged themselves to Childeric. No one of a sane mind will deny that this was done justly, especially since the following events teach us that this change was a very happy one. For, the kingdom of the Franks was never more powerful, or religion in Gaul more flourishing than it was during the time of Pepin and Charlemagne,

Finally, there is the fact, as almost all the cited authors write, that the one who, at the command of the Pontiff, anointed and crowned Pepin as king, was a very holy man, namely, St. Boniface, bishop and martyr, who certainly never was the author of injustice and public wickedness.

Indeed it can be shown very easily that it was not because of this that Pepin or Charlemagne bestowed the primacy on the Pontiff in Gaul and Germany.

First of all, because no one has written about this except Calvin. The author cited, and especially Paul Aemelius, say that the kings of the Franks received the protection of the apostolic See against the Langobards, and other enemies, and that they gave the exarchate of Ravenna to the Pontiff, and certain other temporal things, but there was never any mention about spiritual power.

Then if the nobles of the kingdom through legates sought to be absolved by the Pontiff from their oath, and that they should be permitted to transfer the kingdom from Childeric to Pepin, as Paul Aemelius writes in book 2, and other write the same thing, certainly they thought that the Pontiff presided over the whole Church, and especially over the Franks. For otherwise, why did they not seek this from their own bishops, or why, without the permission of the Pope, did they not do what they wanted to do? Indeed why did they expect that the Pope would command it, as Rheginus and others write? Therefore if the Pontiff exercised primacy over the Franks before Pepin was made king, how could he have received that primacy from king Pepin? Are not those things contradictory?

Finally, before the time of Pepin it is certain that the Franks and Germans were subject to the Roman Pontiffs in spiritual things. For, St. Boniface, the bishop of Mainz, wrote a letter to Pope Zachary, when Charlemagne was still a prince, as he says in the same place; therefore it was before Pepin became king. For it is certain that Charlemagne, having renounced his title, became a monk before Pepin was made king; but in that letter he says openly that the Churches in Germany at the time were subject to the Pontiff, and among other things he asks the Pontiff to erect three episcopates in Germany, and that he

should give him authority to call together a council of bishops in France, and many other things of the same nature.

Likewise Bede, who preceded Pepin by about a hundred years, in book 2, chapter 1 of his histoiy of the English people, said: *Since Gregory exercises primacy in the whole world.* I believe that Calvin does not exclude Gaul and Germany from the whole world.

St. Gregory, who preceded Pepin by almost 200 years, in book 4, letter 52 to all the bishops of the Gauls, sends his directions to Virgilius, the bishop of Arles, and orders him to send the more serious cases to himself for the judgment of the apostolic See: *Because,* he said, *it is right that a suitable decision doubtless is to be given by us.*

St. Leo, who preceded Pepin by 350 years, in letter 89 to the bishops of Gaul said: *Your fraternity recognizes that the apostolic See has been consulted also by the priests of your province on many different things, and that they were judged according to the nature of the different cases, and either rejected or confirmed.*

St. Cyprian, who lived more than 500 years before Pepin, in book 3, latter 13 writes to Pope Stephen asking that the bishop of Arles be deposed and replaced by someone else. Finally, Irenaeus, who preceded Pepin by 600 years, in book 3, chapter 3 when he says: *It is a matter of necessity that every Church should agree with this Roman Church, on account of its preeminent authority, that is, the faithful everywhere, inasmuch as the tradition has been preserved continuously by those [faithful men] who exist everywhere,* does not exclude the Gauls, since he was a bishop in Gaul; I can omit stressing the fact that the Lord, when he said to Peter and to his successors, *Feed my sheep,* doubtless included the Germans and Gauls among his sheep.

CHAPTER XVIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE AUTHORITY WHICH THE ROMAN PONTIFF EXERCISED OVER THE OTHER BISHOPS

The sixth argument is taken from the authority, which the ancient pontiffs always exercised over the other bishops. Hence we read that bishops in the whole world have been appointed by the Roman Pontiffs, or deposed, or restored; of these each one is sufficient of itself to prove the primacy.

In the first place, many examples can be cited about the appointment of bishops. Thus, in session 7 of the Council of Chalcedon we read that Maximus of Antioch was confirmed in the bishopric by St. Leo. Likewise, concerning the confirmation of Anatolius as bishop of Constantinople, the same Leo writes this in letter 54 to Martianus: *It is enough that by the help of your piety, and by the assent of my approval he has obtained the episcopate of such a great city.*

And in letter 84 to Anastasius, bishop of Thessalonica, he said: *Concerning the person of the bishop to be consecrated, and the clergy and people, the metropolitan bishop refers this to your fraternity; and what is pleasing in the province should let you know that your authority makes sure that the ordination is properly celebrated.* And after that: *For as we want the just elections to be vexed by no delays, so we permit nothing to be presumed that you do not know about.* And in letter 87 to the bishops of Africa he said: *Donatus, having been converted, as we understand, from Novatian together with his people, we want him to preside over the Lord's flock in such a way that he remembers to direct to us a written account of his faith.*

St Gregory in book 4, letter 34 to Constantia Augusta wrote: *The bishop of the city of Salona, without my knowledge and approval, was ordained, and the matter took place without the proper procedure.* And passim in his letters he indicates that he is sending the pallium, which is the sign of an archbishop, to the various archbishops of Greece, Gaul, Spain, etc. However, it should be noted that, although the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is proved from the confirmation of bishops, still it is not necessary that all bishops are always confirmed. For, he could grant that power to patriarchs and primates, as it seems he did in many places.

There are also many examples of depositions, and first of all there is this one by Cyprian in book 3, letter 13 to Pope Stephen: *A letter should be sent by you to the province and the people living in Arles, according to which Marciano is removed and another bishop is put in his place.* And after that: *You will make known to us clearly who has taken the place of Marciano, so that we may know to whom we should direct our brothers, and to whom we should write.*

Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 7 in the Institutes derives an argument from this place: *I ask,* he said, *if Stephen then presided over Gaul, would Cyprian not say that you should force them, because they are yours? But he speaks in a very different way. The fraternal charity, he said, by which we are bound together, requires that we admonish each other.*

I respond that those words, which Calvin cites, are to be found nowhere in Cyprian.

Then, if Cyprian thought Stephen was not presiding over the Gauls, but could only admonish them out of friendship, why did not he himself admonish the Gauls?

Nicholas I in a letter to Michael names eight patriarchs of Constantinople, whom the Roman Pontiffs deposed, among whom one was Anthimus, whom Pope Agapitus deposed, notwithstanding the threats of Augustus and Augusta, and in his place he himself by his own hands ordained Menas of Constantinople, as Liberatus writes in chapter 21 of the Breviarium and Zonaras in the life of Justinian. Likewise Gelasius in a letter to bishop Dardanus said: *The apostolic See by its own authority condemned Dioscorus, the bishop of the second See.* And in the same place: *The See of blessed Peter did not accept Peter of Alexandria, whom it knew was not only condemned but also removed.*

Moreover, Damasus deposed Flavian, the patriarch of Antioch, as Theodoretus writes in book 5, chapter 23 of his History. And although the Emperor Theodotius supported Flavian in the episcopate, nevertheless he ordered him to go to Rome to plead his case. And Theophilus of Alexandria through his legates interceded for Flavian before the Roman Pontiff, as Socrates reports in book 5, chapter 15 of his History and Sozomenus in book 8, chapter 3 says that Chiysostom rendered similar assistance. Finally, Flavian was not able to have the episcopacy until the Roman Pontiff, being satisfied, gave his consent, and he promised to accept his legates, and he immediately sent to the Pope many bishops and important priest of the Church of Antioch, as Theodoretus writes in the same place.

Sixtus III also deposed Polychronius, the bishop of Jerusalem, having sent the archdeacon St. Leo to Jerusalem for this purpose; later he became Pope, as is clear from Volume 1 of the Councils concerning the actions of Sixtus III. Therefore, if the Roman Pontiff at various times deposed all the patriarchs, that is, of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, certainly he is he supreme judge in the Church.

Finally, there are also many examples of the restoration of bishops deposed by others. For, Cyprian in book 1, letter 4 said: *He cannot rescind an ordination properly conferred; and Basilides, after his crimes were made known, went to Rome and deceived our colleague Stephen, who is far away and was ignorant of the real situation and the truth; he went there in order to ask that he be restored unjustly to the episcopacy, fi-om which he had been justly deposed, etc.*

Then Julius I reinstated some bishops deposed by an oriental synod—Athanasius of Alexandria, Paul of Constantinople, Marcellus of Ancyra, as Gelasius writes in a letter to bishop Dardanus, and Sozomenus in book 3, chapter 7. *Since,* he said, *because of the dignity of the See the care of all pertains to him, and he restored their Church to each one of them.* And after that: *Athanasius and Paul are returned to their Sees, and they send the letters of Julius to the bishops of the Orient.* Likewise, concerning Theodoretus, deposed by the second synod of Ephesus, we read this in session 1 of the Council of Chalcedon: *Let the reverend bishop Theodoretus enter to take a part in the synod, because the holy Archbishop Leo has returned the episcopacy to him.* Many similar cases can be cited, to which the adversaries can give absolutely no response, and in fact they do not respond.

But Nilus proposes five arguments against us. The first argument. The Roman bishop is said to be first, because the second after him is Constantinople, the third is Alexandria, the fourth is Antioch, the fifth is Jerusalem; but the first and second are not said to be

superior and inferior, but about those only who are of the same order and dignity. For, the Roman bishop is not said to be first by reason of Tusculum or Tibur, which are subject to him.

I respond that the Roman Pontiff is at the same time a bishop, archbishop, patriarch and pope. And as a bishop he is the first in this province by reason of Ostia, which is the second, and of Portuensis which is the third, and of the others which can be numbered according to their order. But as archbishop he is not first by reason of Ostia, which does not have an archbishop, but a simple bishop subject to the Roman archbishop; but he is first by reason of the archbishops of Ravenna, Milan, and the other archbishops in the West.

Then as the proper patriarch of the West, he is not first by reason of Ravenna and the others, which are not patriarchates, but by reason of the patriarchates of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. And in this way it is possible to number five primary Sees, each one of which presides over many large provinces.

Finally, as pope and head of the whole Church, he is not first by reason of Constantinople or of any other See, but he is the only head and pastor of all, and he does not have any second person or colleague sharing in that power. For, as there must be between the bishops of the same province one who presides over the others, and he is called the archbishop; and between the archbishops of many provinces one who presides over the others, and he is called the patriarch; similarly, between the patriarchs of the same Catholic Church there must be one who presides over the others, and he is called the Pope or Vicar of Christ. But we have already demonstrated with many arguments that this is the Roman Pontiff.

The second argument. The sixth synod in canon 36 renewed the constitution of synods 2 and 4, which attributed to the bishop of Constantinople privileges equal to those which the Roman bishop has. Therefore the Roman bishop does not have more authority or dignity than the bishop of Constantinople; therefore he cannot command all the bishops.

I respond: in the second general Council the bishop of Constantinople was not made equal to the Roman, but he was only placed before the bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, as is clear from canon 5 of the same Council, whose words are these: *It is necessary for the bishop of the city of Constantinople to have the honor of primacy after the Roman bishop, because it is the new Rome.*

But in session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon they added to this canon that it is necessaiy for him to have equal privileges with the Roman Pontiff, but this addition was rejected by the legates of the Pope. The same Council wrote a letter to Leo in which it asked that the decrees of the Council be confirmed; but in that letter the Fathers did not dare to mention those equal privileges, but they only wrote that he should renew the canon of synod 2, according to which the second honor was attributed to the bishop of Constantinople. This letter is contained in the acts of the Council of Chalcedon in session 3.

St. Leo also in letter 59, in which he responds to the Council, and in all the others he wrote concerning this matter, never mentions the equal privileges, but only strongly condemns the ambitious cupidity of the bishop of Constantinople, because he wanted to place himself before Alexandria and Antioch.

Nicephorus also writes in book 17, chapter 9 that when Pope John I came to Constantinople, the pontiff was invited by Emperor Justinian to sit next to Epiphanius, the patriarch of Constantinople, so that they would be seen to be equal. But the pontiff did not want to be seated until, according to the prerogative of the apostolic See, a throne was placed for him above that of Epiphanius. From this it is evident that the canon about the equal privileges was not accepted, even a long time after the Council of Chalcedon, and from that Council it did not have any authority, otherwise Epiphanius would have invoked that canon, and he would not have allowed that in his own Church a throne for the Roman Bishop was placed above his own. Therefore there is only canon 36 of the sixth synod, which made the Constantinople bishop equal to the Roman.

Furthermore, those canons have no legal authority. For, they are not the true canons of the sixth synod, legitimate and ecumenical, but of another assembly, which falsely called itself the sixth synod. For, it is certain that the sixth synod, which was celebrated under Pope Agatho and Emperor Constantine IV, published no canons; but five years after the closing of that synod, again there was a gathering of I know not how many bishops, at the instigation of Justinian the Younger, and they published many canons under the name of the sixth synod. This is easily gathered both from the beginning of the same canons, and from the admission of the bishop of Constantinople in session 4 of the seventh synod. Bede calls these same canons the "erratic synod," and he writes in his book on the six ages concerning Justinian the Younger that they were rejected by Pope Sergius, who was reigning at that time. From this it follows that the false sixth synod either was not general or was not legitimate; for, a general synod cannot be legitimate, if it lacks the authority of the first See, as the Greeks themselves admit in session 6 of the seventh synod.

Then how can a general synod be called legitimate, to which not even one of the Latin bishops was invited? But if it was not legitimate, it is evident that it cannot have any authority. But if it was legitimate, but particular and not general, it could pass laws valid only for those subject to it; therefore it could not pressure the Roman See, or rob her privileges, which however it tried to do, when it attempted to make the See of Constantinople equal to Rome, which otherwise was inferior and subject. For, that the Roman See was never subject to a council of the Greeks is shown from the fact that the Greeks cannot prove such a thing either by some imperial law, or by an ecclesiastical canon, of by reason, or by custom. For there are no laws and canons, which subject the first See to the second; the same point is very much opposed to reason. Finally, no historical evidence can be adduced, whereby it is established that something was done by the authority of the Greek bishops against the Roman Church, or the other Western Churches.

Then either Christ gave the primacy to the Roman Church, as we believe, or certainly the Council of Nicaea did, as Nilus himself teaches. Therefore by what right could the particular council of Trullo take away what Christ himself or a general Council had given? But it is manifest that there was an attempt to take away the primacy of the Roman Church by the granting of those privileges, which the Trullan council sanctioned by its own decree. For it does not excel over others, which has just an equal part.

In addition you can add that although the 2nd and 4th synods did not make

Constantinople equal to the Roman Pontiff, they did make it the second after her; however that was not approved, because the apostolic See opposed it. For, on that account in the 4th synod, when the Greeks wanted to give the second place to the See of Constantinople, and to support this they quoted the decree of the second synod celebrated almost 80 years before, the Roman legates said: *If they had this benefit 80 years ago, what do they want now? If they never had it, why do they want it now?* With these words they signified that the decree was cited in vain, since as it was invalid it was never used.

The third argument. If the Roman Pontiff, because he is the first of the patriarchs, has power over the second, that is, over Constantinople, then similarly Constantinople, because it is the second, has power over Alexandria, which is the third. And Alexandria, because it is the third, is over Antioch, which is the fourth and it has power over Jerusalem, which is the last. But no reason, no law, no custom permits this.

I respond that the Roman Pontiff has power over Constantinople and the other patriarchs not because he is the first patriarch, but because he alone is the Pope of the whole Church, successor of Peter, and vicar general of Christ. As any archbishop does not preside over the other bishops of the same province because he is the first bishop, but because he alone is the archbishop of the province. And any patriarch does not excel in power over all the archbishops subject to him because he is the first archbishop, but because in that region he is the great and only patriarch.

The fourth argument. The Roman Pontiff does not ordain the patriarchs, as the patriarch ordains his own metropolitans, and the metropolitans their own bishops. Therefore he does not precede the patriarchs as they do the metropolitans, and the metropolitans the bishops.

I respond: indeed the Roman Pontiff does not customarily ordain the patriarchs, because it could not be done fittingly, so that either they would come to Rome, or the Pontiff himself would travel to them. However, he does confirm them in writing, as we showed above with the example of Anatolius of Constantinople, and Maximus of Antioch. And the case of Flavian clearly reveals that this confirmation was not an empty formula; for, he never could obtain the Church of Antioch, because the Roman bishop did not consent to it. In this regard, there is no less certainty about the primacy when he deposes or restores a bishop

than when he ordains him. But the Roman Pontiff not once, but as often as it was necessaiy, both deposed and restored patriarchs, as we demonstrated above. Finally, Nilus cannot ignore Menas, the patriarch of Constantinople, who was ordained by the Roman Pontiff Agapitus, since Zonaras wrote about this in his life of Justinian.

The fifth argument. The Council of Nicaea in canon 6 determined their regions for all the patriarchs, and it assigned the West to the Roman, Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis to Alexandria, Syria and Mesopotamia to Antioch. Therefore, the Roman Pontiff ought not to rule all and give commands to the other patriarchs.

I respond that the Council of Nicaea assigned no region to the Roman Pontiff. For, what Nilus says about the West, he learned from the interpretation of Balsamonis, not from the canon itself of the Council. For, in that canon there is nothing about the Roman Pontiff, except this short sentence, which Nilus himself thus quotes: Ε'πει και τω έν τη

Ρ'ώμη έπισκόπω τούτο συνηθές έστιν, that is, since this is customary for the Roman bishop. Since these words indicate the reason why, according to an ancient custom, Egypt, Libya and Pentapolis were subject to Alexandria, they cannot have any meaning other than this, namely, that the Roman Pontiff was accustomed to commit the government of those three provinces to the bishop of Alexandria.

Then, if the Council of Nicaea wanted to determine the authority of the Roman Pontiff, why did it not begin with him? Why did it begin with Alexandria, which was second? And why did it not mention the region which it assigned to the Roman Pontiff? You can add to this finally that although the Nicene Council said in clear words that the West pertains properly to the Roman Pontiff, still Nilus gets absolutely no benefit from this. For that doubtless must be understood to be about the patriarchal authority of the Roman Pontiff, in addition to which the same Pontiff has supreme power over the whole Church. There it is to be observed also in passing what Nilus says—that the West must be subject to the Roman Pontiff. This was omitted by Illyricus, his faithful interpreter, namely, lest Illyricus himself, according to the testimony of Nilus, be forced to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.

CHAPTER XIX

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM LAWS, DISPENSATIONS AND CENSURES

The seventh argument can be derived from the authority of passing laws, dispensing and punishing, which the Roman Pontiff exercised over the sons of the Church, even though they were powerful and noble men. Many examples can be given regarding the laws, for there were very few Pontiffs who did not decree something.

St. Leo in letter 1 writes to the bishops of Campania, Picenum, Etruria, and to those in all the provinces, and at the end of the letter he says this: *Our admonition denounces this—that if one of the brothers acts against these laws, or tries to do so, and dares to do what is prohibited, he should know that he will be removed from his office.* And after that: *We bid you, beloved, to keep all the decretal rules of Innocent of blessed memory, and also of all our predecessors, which have been promulgated about the orders of the Church and the discipline of the canons, and to keep them in such wise that if any have transgressed them he may know at once that all indulgence is denied him.* Likewise in letter 81 to bishop Dioscorus of Alexandria he prescribed two laws, and in both he uses these words: *We want this also to be observed by you.*

Pope Hilary while presiding over a Roman council said: *It is not permitted for anyone, without danger of losing his position, to disobey either the divine constitutions or the decrees of the apostolic See.* Pope Anastasius the Younger in a letter to Emperor Anastasius said: *The apostolic precepts, which have been enacted by the holy Roman Church and the apostolic authority, should not be resisted with pride, but they should be observed profitably by obedience, if you wish to have communion with the holy Church of God, which is your head.* St. Gregory in a privilege which he gave to the monastery of St. Medard, which is found at the end of his letter, said: *If any of the kings, or presiding judges, or secular persons violates the decrees of this apostolic authority and our precept, let him be deprived of his honor.*

We have an example of dispensations in letter 1 of Gelasius (for we are intentionally passing over many more recent examples): *We are forced by the necessary disposition of things, and we agree with the management of the apostolic See, to so free the decrees of the paternal canons, and to measure the precepts of our predecessors of times past, so that what the necessity of the present times requires to be relaxed for the restoration of Churches, given the necessary careful consideration, we will moderate them as much as possible.* Likewise, Gregory in book 12, letter 31 to bishop Felix of Sicily says that he dispensed the Angli concerning marriages in the forbidden degrees, and also the Siculians so that they may celebrate a council only once a year, since otherwise the rules prescribed that councils be celebrated twice a year. In addition, that rule, from which Gregory gave the dispensation, is canon 5 of the first general Council.

There are many examples of censures and some are very ancient. For, Innocent I, when he heard that Chrysostom had died, excommunicated the Emperor Arcadius and his wife Eudoxia, who did not allow Chrysostom to be restored to his See, as Innocent himself had ordered. The letter of Innocent about this matter can be found in the work of

Nicephorus in book 13, chapter 34.

An objection cannot be made from the fact that Ambrose also, who was not the sovereign pontiff, excommunicated the emperor; for, Ambrose did that in his own Church, when the Emperor lived in Milan. But Ambrose never would have attempted to excommunicate someone outside the diocese of Milan. Innocent also excommunicated the emperors of Constantinople, while they were living in Constantinople. Then Gregory III similarly excommunicated the Greek Emperor Leo, according to Zonaras in the life of Leo Isaurus.

Nicholas I threatened to excommunicate King Lotharius, and really did excommunicate his concubine Valdradas, and also the archbishops of Cologne and Treves. Concerning this histoiy the Magdeburgenses lie shamelessly in Centuries 9, chapter 10, where they say that King Lotharius and those archbishops were unjustly harassed by Pope Nicholas. For, as Rhegino in book 2, Otto of Freising in book 6, chapter 3, and Sigebertus in the Chronicle for the year 862 write: Lotharius out of hatred for his wife Thietberga, and out of love for his concubine, having hired false witnesses, accused his wife of incest, and then by the authority of the archbishops of Cologne and Treves he repudiated her and married his concubine; the archbishops later confessed to all of this in a council in Rome.

If, therefore, the Magdeburgenses, as they do, want Lotharius and the archbishops to be justified in this, then it is necessary for them to accuse Paul, who teaches in 1 Cor. 7 that, while the first wife is still living, it is not possible to marry someone else because of fornication. So what are we to say in the case of the wife of Lotharius who did not sin, but was condemned because of the words of false witnesses: do the Magdeburgenses also justify false testimonies, so that they can in some way reprimand the Pope?

But we have an example that is more famous and more ancient. For, when Pius I decreed that Easter was not to be celebrated with the Jews on the fourteenth day of the first month, but on the following Sunday, and the Asians did not want to accept this: Pope Victor I excommunicated all of them around the year of the Lord 190, as Eusebius reports in book 5, chapter 24 of his History.

But Calvin objects in book 4, chapter 7 § 7 of his Institutes that because of this Victor was reprimanded by Irenaeus, and it seems that it was done rightly and was not contradicted. I respond that Irenaeus and many others blamed Victor, because he cutoff from the unity of the ecclesiastical body such great Churches for such a trivial reason as it seemed to them. Eusebius reports this in the same place, but we read nowhere that Victor changed his decision. And even if Victor had changed his mind, it would not help Calvin. For, we would say that Victor bound the Asians with the same power with which he absolved them.

Then the reproving from Irenaeus, and of others, does not weaken our argument, but rather strengthens it. For, to the extent that there were many who were displeased with the decision of Victor, to that extent they could have more easily contemned him, and rather excommunicate Victor, if they thought that Victor was only one of all the bishops, and not rather the head and judge of all. But there were none who said that his decision was invalid, or who thought that Victor should be contemned or excommunicated; and they did not admonish him that he had exceeded the limits of his own power and had judged

those not subject to him. Above all they should have warned him about this, if Victor truly was not the judge of all. Therefore they thought that Victor did what he could do, but not what he ought to have done; for, that is the meaning of their words: *Their writings also exist,* said Eusebius, *in which they strongly blame Victor, as if he were uselessly promoting the advantage of the Church.*

However, it should be noted here that, although Irenaeus and others at the time thought Victor had acted imprudently, still he really acted very prudently, as the whole Church judged later. For, one of the principal authors of the proposal to celebrate Easter with the Jews was a man called Blastus, who in that way wanted gradually to introduce Judaism, as Tertullian writes near the end of his book on prescription. *Blastus,* he said, *secretly wanted to introduce Judaism; for he says that Passover should be observed only according to the law of Moses on the fourteenth day of the month.* But this Blastus began to promote his heresy in Rome during the time of Pope Victor, as Eusebius says in book 5, chapter 15 of his History.

Therefore, since Pope Victor saw that that diversity concerning Easter was not just a diversity of observance alone, but brought with it a heresy, in fact Judaism itself, so he thought that it should be opposed immediately. The Fathers at the Council of Nicaea approved the decision of Victor, as is clear from Eusebius in book 3 on the life of Constantine; afterwards those who disagreed with Victor were considered heretics and were called the Fourteeners, as is clear from Epiphanius in heresy 50, and from Augustine in heresy 29.

CHAPTER XX

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE VICARS OF THE POPE

The eighth argument is taken from the fact that the sovereign pontiffs had their own vicars in various regions, either ordinarily or just for a time, but with the reservation of major cases to the Pope himself.

For, just as from the fact that a king sends representatives to the provinces, we understand that those provinces are subject to the king; and similarly, from the fact that a king entrusts judicial cases to the governors of provinces with the reservation of certain cases to himself, we understand that the king is the supreme judge; so also from the fact that the apostolic See had vicars in almost all of the distant regions, or committed its own power for a time to someone, and still wanted the more serious cases to be referred to itself, we rightly conclude that the supreme judgment of the whole Church pertains to the apostolic See. There are many examples of this.

Leo in letter 84 makes bishop Anastasius of Thessalonica his vicar for the East, just as the predecessors of St. Leo had their own vicars, as he says in the same place. This seems to be the reason why the council of Sardis in canon 20 decreed that foreign clerics should not stay for a long time in Thessalonica; for, since the vicar of the Pope resided there, clerics flocked there from all of Greece, and often stayed longer than necessary. The same Pope in letter 87 entrusts his office to bishop Potentius in the regions of Africa.

Pope Celestine made Cyril of Alexandria his vicar in the case of Nestorius, the bishop of Constantinople, and put him in charge of the Church in Constantinople after Nestorius was deposed. On this see the letter of Celestine to Cyril in volume 4 of the works of Cyril, and in the same place the letter of Cyril to the clergy and people of Constantinople.

Gelasius in a letter to bishop Dardanus said: *Why did Acacius refuse to refer to the apostolic See, by whom he knew he was delegated to take care of those regions?* He is speaking about Acacius, the bishop of Constantinople, to whom the Roman Pontiff had committed the care of Egypt, and had commanded him to depose the bishop of Alexandria.

Hormisdas in a letter to bishop Salustus of Spain makes him his vicar for Boetia and Lusitania. Justinian in collat.9, title 9 writes that the bishop of Justiniana should preside in those places as the vicar of the Roman Pontiff, because Pope Vigilius had so decreed.

Gregory in book 4, letter 52 constituted Virgil, bishop of Arles, as his vicar, and as before he reserved the more serious cases to himself.

CHAPTER XXI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE RIGHT OF APPEALS

The ninth argument can be taken from the fact that, from all parts of the Christian world, legitimate appeals were made to the Roman Pontiff, but there was no appeal from his decision. This is a certain argument for his primacy, as our adversary himself admits. For Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 9 of his Institutes said: *It is certain that the supreme power belongs to the one to whose tribunal an appeal is made.* But he then adds immediately: *Many often appealed to the Roman Pontiff; he also tried to attract to himself knowledge of these cases, but he was always mocked whenever he exceeded his limits.* Therefore, Calvin says that many appealed to the pontiff in order to avoid legitimate judgments, but that appeals of that kind were laughed at; as now someone truly would be laughed at, who was condemned by the bishop of Florence and then appealed to the bishop of Milan; or being condemned by the king of Spain, he then appealed to the king of France.

Therefore, it must be proved that one could justly appeal to the pontiff, and that the appeals were not laughed at, but were received with honor and processed. First of all it is proved from the council of Sardis, which was a general council, and was always accepted in the Church. For, Sulpitius in book 2 of his sacred history writes that it was assemblée from the whole world, and Socrates in book 2, chapter 16 of his Church History calls il a general council.

Moreover, as Athanasius writes in the beginning of Apology 2, and Hilary in the book on the councils, at that council there were more than 300 Catholic bishops from thirty-six provinces of the whole Christian world, all of which Athanasius names, like Italy, Gaul, Spain, Britannia, Africa, Egypt, Syria, Thrace, Tannonia, and others. The legates of Pope Julius were also present, as Athanasius reports in the same place. Likewise, that this synod bound the whole Church is evident from the words which appear at the end of the council: *Let the Catholic Church spread throughout the world observe everything which has been decreed here.*

Finally, even the Magdeburgenses described this synod as legitimate in Centuries 4, chapter 9. Therefore in this synod there are two canons concerning this matter, the fourth and the seventh. The fourth canon says this: *When a bishop has been deposed by the judgment of other bishops, who preside in the neighboring places, and he says he is going to take his case to the city of Rome, another bishop is not to be ordained to occupy his See, after his appeal has been made, unless the case was decided in the judgment of the Roman Bishop.*

Here is the seventh canon: *It seemed good that if a bishop was accused, and the bishops of the region judged him, and removed him from his position, if the one accused should make an appeal, and betakes himself to the bishop of the Roman Church, and wants to be heard, if the Pope thinks it just that the case be reviewed, he should write to these bishops, who are in the neighboring provinces, that they diligently require and define the case according to the faith of truth. But if he who asks that his case be heard again, by his entreaty for forgiveness moves the Roman Bishop to send a priest as his*

representative, what he wishes and what he determines will be the decision of Rome. But if he should judge that the bishops suffice to put an end to the affair, let him do what he judges right according to his wise counsel.

Secondly, it is proved from Gelasius, who in his letter to Faustus said: *These are the canons which say that the appeals of the whole Church are to be referred to the examination of this See, but they also decreed that no appeal can be made anywhere from a decision of this See.* And in a letter to bishop Dardanus he said: *To this See canons can be appealed from any part of the world, but from it no one is allowed to appeal.*

Thirdly, it is proved from the examples of those who have appealed. For, even before the council of Sardis, there was a custom in the Church of appealing to the pontiff, and as Leo says well in letter 89 to the bishops of Gaul, this was an ancient custom.

In the year 142 of Christ, when Pius I was the pontiff, Marcion, who had been excommunicated by his bishop in Pontus, came to Rome, to be absolved by the Roman Church, as Epiphanius recounts in Heresies 42.

In the year 252, when Cornelius was Pope, Fortunatus and Felix, having been deposed in Africa by Cyprian, travelled to Rome and made an appeal to Cornelius, according to the testimony of Cyprian in book 1, letter 3. Not long after that, when Stephen was pontiff Basilides, having been deposed in Spain, appealed to Stephen, according to Cyprian in book 1, letter 4.

In the year 350, when Julius 1 was the pontiff, Athanasius, having been deposed by the Eastern bishops, appealed to the pontiff, and he was restored by him, as we showed above from Sozomenus in book 3, chapter 7, and this judgment was made before the council of Sardis, as Athanasius says at the beginning of Apology 2.

After the year 400, when Innocent I was the pontiff, Chrysostom, having been deposed by Theophilus, appealed to the pontiff, as is clear from his two letters to Innocent. Likewise, in the same century Flavian, the bishop of Constantinople, appealed to Leo, as Liberatus writes in chapter 11 of the Breviarium, and Theodoretus appealed to him too, as is apparent from his letter to Leo.

After the year 500 Gregory in book 2, letter 6 removes sacred communion from John, the Greek bishop of the first Justinian, because he had judged bishop Thebanus, who had appealed to the apostolic See. I am omitting the witnesses of later times, because they are not recognized by the heretics. Now the arguments of Nilus, Illyricus and Calvin will be refuted.

CHAPTER XXII

THE ARGUMENTS OF NILUS ON THE RIGHT OF APPEALS ARE REFUTED

In his book on the primacy, Nilus claims with two arguments that an appeal can be made to the bishop of Constantinople in the same way as it is made to the Roman Pontiff; and therefore that they are equals, and there is not one Roman Pontiff presiding over the whole Church.

This is his first argument, which is based on the fact that the sixth Council granted to the bishop of Constantinople privileges equal to those of the Roman Pontiff. But this argument was already refuted above. Nilus takes his second argument from the Council of Chalcedon, in canons 9 and 17, where it is decreed: if a cleric has a claim against another cleric, it will be judged by his bishop; if it is against the bishop, by the archbishop; if it is against the archbishop, by the primate of the diocese or by the bishop of Constantinople. Therefore the final judgment is referred to the ecumenical patriarch of the royal city.

I respond: who in the canon is called the first in the diocese is not completely clear, and in fact the archdeacon and John of Turrecremata on the canon "Si clericus 11," question 1, teach that the Primate of the diocese is called the bishop who is greater than the archbishop, but less than the patriarch. But Pope Nicholas I in a letter to Emperor Michael writes that by the words "primate of the diocese" no one else can be meant except the Roman Bishop. This opinion seems to be more true, both because it has a more serious, ancient and learned author, and because it cannot easily be proved that, at the time of the Council of Chalcedon there was in the Church, and especially in the East, any primates distinct from archbishops and patriarchs; and also because the Greek word of this canon, ἐξαρχος, does not really mean a primate, but a head; this word pertains much more fittingly to the Sovereign Pontiff than it does to a primate; for he alone is truly the head of each and every Christian diocese.

Given these comments, I respond first of all that the canon was rightly explained by Nicholas in the place cited; this means that the council decreed that whoever has a case with the metropolitan should go to the head of the diocese, that is, to the Roman Pontiff; or, if he is near the city of Constantinople, and wishes to be content with the judgment of that bishop, let him go to him. Thus the first general law is established about approaching the Roman Pontiff, then a permission is added for those only who live near Constantinople.

Secondly, it can be responded that all these canons have no force among us, unless they have been accepted by the Roman Pontiff. For, Leo in letter 59 to the Council of Chalcedon writes that he approved that Council only with regard to its explanation of the faith. And Liberatus in chapter 12 of the Breviarium testifies that all those canons were enacted when the legates of the Pope were absent, who otherwise presided over the Council. Then custom, which is the interpreter of laws, clearly teaches that it was never permitted to appeal to the patriarch of Constantinople, except from the places subject to that patriarch. For no case can be adduced, so far as we know, that an appeal was made to the Eastern Church from the West, or from the South, or even from the North.

Thirdly, even if we were to concede that, according to these canons, an appeal could be made from the whole world to the judgment of the bishop of Constantinople, still it would not follow that this bishop is equal to the Roman Pontiff. For, based on the force of that canon of Chalcedon, the bishop of Constantinople can judge only those who think they have been offended by their metropolitan; but the Roman Pontiff can also judge those who have been offended by the patriarchs themselves, or by a council of bishops, no matter how important or frequent, as the examples of Athanasius, Paul, Chrysostom, Flavian and Theodoretus make very clear.

Finally, it should be noted that the canon of Chalcedon really is not about an appeal, but about the first judgment, which Nilus failed to notice. Therefore, although the bishop of Constantinople could judge any cases from the whole world, still an appeal could be made from him to the Roman bishop according to the canons of Sardis. For the Chalcedon canons are in no way opposed to the canons of Sardis. Thus the final judgment always remains in the hands of the Roman Bishop.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE FIRST ARGUMENT OF THE LUTHERANS IS REFUTED

Let us now examine the arguments of the Lutherans. First of all, the adversaries make an objection taken from Cyprian, who says in book 1, letter 3: *Now since it has been decreed by all of us, and it is both fair and just, that the case of each person is to be heard where the crime was committed; and it is also necessary that those over whom we preside do not go running elsewhere, etc.* And after that: *Unless it has to do with a few hopeless and miserable cases, the authority of the bishops in Africa will seem to be inferior.* There he reprimands those who had appealed to the Roman Pontiff, and he proves that such appeals should not be made, both because it was so decreed in the council of the bishops, and because the authority of the African bishops is no less than that of the Roman bishop.

I respond that Cyprian was distressed because of the appeals of those who had been convicted and judged concerning their manifest crimes; but he was not totally opposed to such appeals. That is gathered from book 1, letter 4 where, when speaking about Basilides, who was condemned in Spain and had appealed to Stephen, he says: *For he* (Stephen) *is not so much to be blamed for his negligence in handling the matter, as he* (Basilides) *is to be cursed, who approached him with a fraudulent case.* But certainly if it were not allowed for Stephen in any way to admit appeals, certainly he would have to be blamed for not rejecting the case, even if Basilides had had a just cause.

Therefore concerning what Cyprian says was accepted by all, namely, that *the case is to be heard where the crime was committed,* I say that by this decree it is determined that the case should be judged first where the crime was committed; but there is no prohibition that it be judged again elsewhere.

But you will say: with this decree Cyprian proves that there should be no appeal; therefore appeals are forbidden. I respond that Cyprian is not arguing from this decree alone, but from this decree along with the manifest circumstances of the crimes of the guilty persons. For Cyprian reasons like this: according to the decree of the council, the case of each person is to be heard were the crime is admitted; their case has already been heard, and their crimes have been proved clearly; therefore, why do they appeal to Rome, unless perhaps it is to impose on the Pope, or at least to harass the bishops who have passed judgment on them?

You can add that if, by this decree, appeals were prohibited, they would not only be prohibited to the Roman Pontiff, but also to any other judge, as the Magdegurgenses admit in Centuries 3, chapter 7, col. 176, and the words themselves indicate this, since they are quite general. But it would be an absurd and ridiculous law, which would prohibit any appeal. For in what kind of republic, no matter how primitive, would a law of this kind be tolerated, which would not allow an appeal from any judge? Therefore, since the Centuriatorians attribute this kind of law to the Church of God, which is a wisely ordered form of government, they show themselves to be totally absurd and ridiculous.

But to the addition made by Cyprian—that the bishops of Africa do not have less authority, I respond that the "less" is not a comparison to the Roman Pontiffs, but to the

case which is now being considered. For, the meaning is that the bishops of Africa did not have less authority than what was needed in order to judge that case.

CHAPTER XXIV

THREE OTHER ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

Secondly, they raise an objection relating to Damasus, who in a letter to Theophilus and Anysius, which is 79 among the letters of Ambrose, said this: *Since it was a judgment of this kind, of the council of Capua, as adjacent to Bonoso, and the judges heard his accusers, we declare that it is not fitting for us to pass judgment on this case.*

I respond first of all that this letter is not from Damasus. In the works of Ambrose it is attributed to Ambrose; but it can also not be one of his letters, because in it there is the mention of Ambrose as some other person. Therefore it is uncertain who wrote it.

Secondly, I say: If it is a letter of Damasus, as many people say, Damasus does not say that he cannot judge the case, but that it is not fitting that he judge it, which is well said. For, although the Pontiff is the supreme judge, still it is not fitting thaζ when a provincial council has decreed something, he should judge otherwise without a good reason.

Thirdly, in book 4, chapter 7 § 9 of his Institutes Calvin raises an objection from the council of Mileum, in whose canon 22 there is the following decree: *But if they think they should make an appeal from them,* that is, from the neighboring bishops, *they should not appeal, except to African councils, or to the primates of their own provinces. But if someone thinks he should make an appeal across the sea, he will be received in communion by no one within Africa.*

Some respond to this with Gratian, who in question 2, canon 6, added an exception to this canon, that is, unless perhaps an appeal is made to the apostolic See. But this exception does not seem to fit exactly, because the Africans decided especially because of the Roman Church, that it would not be allowed to appeal across the sea; for it was not customary for the Africans ever to appeal across the sea, except to the Roman See. And it is not necessary to resort to these rare exceptions, since the true answer is obvious.

Therefore the response is that this canon is not related to our point; for, the question about appeals to the Roman Pontiff is not about the appeals of priests or minor clerics, but about the appeals of bishops. Indeed the council of Sardis, which wanted bishops to be able to appeal to the Pontiff, in canons 4 and 7, also wanted the cases of priests and minor clerics to be handled by neighboring bishops, so that it would be allowed for minor clerics to appeal from their own bishop to other bishops of the same province, as it is stated in canon 17. Pope Zosimus wanted these two canons to be renewed and put into practice in Africa, as is clear from council VI of Carthage, and from the letter of the same council to Pope Boniface.

Then canon 22 of the council of Mileum is speaking about priests and minor clerics, not about bishops, as is clear both from Augustine, who was present at this council, and still he writes in letter 162 that African bishops are permitted to appeal across the sea, but minor clerics are not allowed to do so, and from the words of the council itself, for it begins like this: *It seemed good that priests, deacons, or other lower clerics in the cases that they have, etc.* Therefore, Innocent I approved the whole council of Mileum

in his letter to the council, which is number 93 among the letters of blessed Augustine, which certainly Innocent would not have written, if in it anything was derogated from the apostolic See. Hence the ignorance and negligence of Calvin are apparent, who in the cited place says that Zosimus tried to bring it about that that canon of the council of Mileum should be corrected in council VI of Carthage, since on the contrary it is certain that Zosimus ordered that the canon should be confirmed and put into practice.

But you will say: If that is the situation, by what right did the Roman Pontiff receive the priest Apiarius, who made an appeal from Africa, and restored him to his office, as the African Fathers say in their letter to Boniface and in another letter to Celestine.

I respond: Although it was forbidden for clerics of a lower order to appeal from the bishops of their own province, however it was not prohibited, nor could it be forbidden for the Sovereign Pontiff, to accept such an appeal if he so wished. Moreover, the Roman Pontiffs not only accepted the appeal of Apiarius, but they also listened to his complaints, and ordered the Africans to study his case carefully and to judge it faithfully. From these two letter it appears that Apiarius went to Rome two times, and both times he returned to Africa and there he was judged in a council after his return from the city.

Fourthly, in book 4, chapter 7 § 10 in his Institutes Calvin raises an objection based on letter 162 of Augustine, where we read that the case of Caecilianus, at the command of the Emperor, was judged by the pontiff and by some others. Then he was judged a second time by the bishop of Arles, at the command of the same Emperor; and he was judged a third time by the Emperor. But if the pontiff, by divine right, is the supreme judge, why did he not judge him on his own, rather than at the command of the Emperor? Likewise, if it is not possible to make an appeal from him, how is it that there was an appeal in the case of Caecilianus, and that he was judged by the bishop of Arles after the decision of the Pontiff, and again by the Emperor? Finally, why did he allow associates to be imposed on him by the Emperor in the first judgment?

I respond to the first objection that the Pontiff did not judge, except when the Emperor requested it, because the Donatists did not bring that case first of all to the Pontiff, as they should have done, but they brought it to the Emperor. Augustine says in the same place that they acted badly in this case; there he also says that the Emperor Constantine acted in a very orderly manner, since he did not dare to judge the case presented to him, but he sent it to the Pontiff.

To the second objection I say that the Pontiff permitted others assigned by the Emperor to sit with him in order to satisfy the Donatists, who were suspicious of the Roman Pontiff.

To the third objection I say that the bishop of Arles judged the case after the pontiff, and after the Emperor, not because it was necessary, as Augustine says in the same place, but in order to completely shut the mouth of the Donatists. Therefore, the Emperor, as Augustine says in the same place, seeking the favor of the bishops, heard the case unwillingly.

CHAPTER XXV

THE LAST ARGUMENT IS REFUTED

Finally, Calvin in the place cited and the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 5, chapter 9, and also the Greeks in the Council of Florence in session 20, but especially Illyricus in his book on the history of the Sixth Council of Carthage seek an argument, which they think is very strong, from the histoiy of that Council of which the following is a summaiy.

Pope Zosimus through his legates sought from the Africans that the three canons of the Council of Nicaea should be put into practice: one is on the appeals of bishops to the Roman Pontiff; the second is on the appeals of priests and minor clerics to neighboring bishops; the third is on not going to the court, that is, the African bishops are not to go to the court of the emperor.

The Africans, after having received these mandates, assembled a national council of 217 bishops, and they responded to Pope Boniface, who had succeeded Zosimus after his death. They said that they did not find those canons in the Nicene Council, and so they would write to the patriarchs of the East, in Constantinople and Alexandria, and ask them to send to themselves authentic copies of the Nicene Council; in the meantime, however, they would observe those canons, until a more careful examination could be made of the authentic examples. In the meantime, copies of the decrees of the Nicene Council arrived from Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople, and in them those three canons were not found, but only the twenty which are reproduced in book 10, chapter 6 of Ruffini's History, which history also cites Cyril's letter to the Africans.

Therefore since the Africans did not find those canons in the examples sent to them, they wrote to Pope Celestine, who had succeeded Boniface, that since in the Nicene Council those canons were not found, then he should not easily accept appeals from Africa. This matter is contained in the Sixth Council of Carthage, and in those two letters. But what the Pontiff said in reply is not given there.

On this histoiy Illyricus and the Magdeburgenses build an immense heap of insults and lies, and on account of that two arguments. With regard to the insults, Illryicus in his book on this history petulantly inverts the names of almost all the Pontiffs of that time. For in passing he calls Innocent "Nocentius" (= criminal); St. Boniface is "Malefacium"; St. Celestine is "Infernal"; he calls St. Leo sometimes an infernal Wolf, sometimes a roaring Lion.

In order to refute this petulance, the acts of the council of Carthage and the letters of that council to Boniface and Celestine will be sufficient, all of which Illyricus has included in his little book. For, the more petulantly and mockingly Illyricus speaks about those holy pontiffs, so much the more the African Fathers speak respectfully and gravely about them. Also, see what Augustine says about the praises of these pontiffs in letter 157 to Optatus and in book 1 to Boniface and Prosper at the end of his book on the Collations.

Indeed there are almost as many lies in the book of Illyricus as there are sentences; I will cite just a few from the multitude. At the very beginning of the book he says that at the Sixth Council of Carthage Prosper, Orosius and other important men were present

together with Augustine. But Prosper and Orosius are not named as being at the Council, and they could not be there, since they were not bishops, nor Africans, and the Council was composed only of African bishops.

Briefly after that Illyricus says that Eulalius was elected in schism together with Pope Boniface, but that Eulalius, having been elected by the majority of the clergy and people, was a man of such modesty that he willingly deferred to Boniface, although otherwise the pontificate rightly belonged to him. But Illyricus says this without any proof, and against him we can produce the librarian Anastasius, who in the life of the same Boniface writes that Eulalius was rejected by the council of 252 bishops as having been unjustly ordained, but that Boniface was confirmed by all.

To this Illyricus says, and repeats often, that the Roman bishops requested from the African bishops that jurisdiction be given them in Africa, and in all other regions, and when they had considered this matter for a full five years, it was finally decided by the Council that no such right would be conceded to the pontiff.

But that is not only a lie, because neither such a request nor such a decision is found in that Council, but it is also a shameless lie, because it is asserted without any probability. For who believes that the Roman Pontiffs sought from the Africans jurisdiction over the Asians and the Europeans? Similarly, who believes that the African Fathers struggled over this matter for five years, when they could have responded with one word that they did not have any authority over other nations, and therefore could not grant it to others? Would not the man be laughed at who sought from the king of France jurisdiction over Spain? And would not the king himself appear ridiculous, if he spent five years deliberating about this matter?

There is another lie, and it is a serious one and repeated a thousand times in the book of Illyricus and in the Centuries, namely, that Pope Zosimus deliberately and against his conscience falsified the Council of Nicaea, so that with this deception he might impose a burden on the Africans. In the refutation of the arguments we will speak about this lie. Therefore, having made these few remarks, let us now address the arguments.

First: If by divine right the Pope is the supreme judge of the whole Church, why do the pontiffs endeavor to confirm their right of appeal to the apostolic See not from the divine law, but from the Council of Nicaea? And why do so many Catholic and holy Fathers in the Council of Carthage refuse to admit that right, unless it is found in the Council of Nicaea?

We respond briefly to this argument of theirs that by divine right one could always appeal to the Sovereign Pontiff, but whether it was expedient to use that power, and in all places, there was some doubt not without good reason. For, reasons can be adduced for both sides of this question. For if such an appeal were conceded to all, it would easily happen that many would try to escape from their legitimate judgment so that the bishops who made the first judgment would be undeservedly harassed, and cases, which otherwise are easy and evident, would be drawn out for a long time. Hence St. Cyprian in book 1, letters 3 and 4 complains more than once about those who, having been properly judged and condemned, appealed to the pontiff in Rome. And St. Bernard in book 3 on Consideration spells out the many disadvantages which come from the excessive

frequency of appeals.

On the other hand, however, if an appeal were not available to anyone, the occasion would be given to individual bishops to pass judgment easily and rashly, and so to oppress the people in a tyrannical way. And they would think that they do not have a superior and that they have to give an account to no one. This would be nothing other than to divide the one body of Christ into as many parts as there are dioceses.

Therefore since the matter was doubtful, the general Council of Sardis, also with the consent of the pontiff, declared that it was advantageous that ordinarily an appeal was granted to priests and to minor clerics from their own bishop to the provincial council, but bishops could appeal to the apostolic See. But that this declaration was not a new concession is testified to by the examples of those who, before the time of the Councils of Sardis and Nicaea, in every age appealed to the Roman Pontiff.

Why, therefore, in the Council of Carthage did the Roman Pontiffs not cite the divine law, but the Council of Nicaea in order to establish the right of appeal? The reason was, because they wanted to demonstrate not only that an appeal could be made to them by all, but also that it was good for the Church that it was so, because a general Council has thought the same thing.

Similarly, the African bishops wanted to hinder appeals of this kind, because they thought they were not good for their own Churches, although they knew and did not deny that they could not stop them completely. Therefore in both letters, which they sent to the Roman Pontiffs on this matter, they bear witness to their subjection to the apostolic See. and they say they have accepted her mandates, and they do not command but ask that hJ should not easily listen to their appeals. But all of these things will become clearer in the refutation of the second argument.

Therefore the second argument of the Magdeburgenses and of Calvin goes like this: The Roman Pontiffs Zosimus, Boniface and Celestine wanted to prove the right of appeal to the apostolic See from the Council of Nicaea; but when the matter was examined, the falsifiers and corrupters of the Nicene canons were discovered; therefore an appeal cannot be made to their judgment either by human law or by divine law.

First of all we respond that the African Fathers were deceived by ignorance, and that the Magdeburgenses and Calvin are sinning because of malice. For, the Africans in the letter to Celestine repeat twice that they did not find those canons in any definition of the Fathers or in any council. From this it is clear that they did not have the canons of the Council of Sardis, in which the three canons are contained in clear language, and if they had had them, they would have been satisfied with them. For the authority of the Council of Sardis is not less than that of Nicaea; nor is it a greater error to cite the Council of Nicaea for Sardis, as it is to cite Matthew for John, or Jeremiah for Zechariah, as St. Matthew cited in chapter 27. Therefore, just as we cannot call Matthew a forger, because the same Holy Spirit spoke in Jeremiah and in Zechariah, so the Roman Pontiffs should not be called forgers, even if they cited the Council of Nicaea for that of Sardis, since the authority of both Councils is the same. But the Magdeburgenses knew about the Council of Sardis, and they translated it as legitimate in their fourth Century. Therefore it is necessary for them to confess that the Africans were deceived, and their case is

demolished. Therefore, since they nevertheless obstinately attribute victory to them, they contradict themselves and sin out of malice.

But you will say: in the Sixth Council of Carthage, in chapter 6, the Council of Sardis is cited by name; therefore the Africans knew about it.

I respond that those words, by which the Council of Sardis is cited, are from the legates of the Pontiff; for, because of the instructions given to them by Pope Zosimus they cited those words. And I also think that that place has been totally corrupted, and either placed by the secretaries of Sardis as being from Nicaea, or what I suspect even more, that it crept from the margin into that text *From the Sardian Council,* for really the words that are cited there are not found now except in the Sardian Council; but nevertheless the name of the Sardian Council should not be in the text. Since those words are cited from the instructions of Pope Zosimus, which the legates had brought with them from Rome, but the legates said that they were citing the canons from the Nicene Council; hence soon Augustine said in those quoted words: *And we declare that* we *will preserve these words, pending a more careful investigation of the Nicene Council.* With these words he is saying that he accepted the cited canon as being from the Nicene Council.

You can add to this that Augustine in book 3, chapter 34 against Crescentius does not acknowledge any Sardian Council except a certain heretical council of oriental bishops against Athanasius. For there were two Sardian Councils, as is clear from Sozomenus in book 3, chapters 10 and 11 of his History—one a general Catholic Council of about 390 bishops, which Augustine never heard about, and another heretical council of 76 bishops, which Augustine knew about.

Secondly, I say that the canons of the Nicene Council, which are found in Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 6 of his History, and which were sent from the Orient to the Africans, doubtless are not all the canons, which the Nicene Council published. And therefore it is probable that those three canons, which Zosimus quoted from the Nicene Council, really were in that Council. That those canons are not all of them, some prove from the letter of Athanasius to Pope Mark, in which he asks for a copy of the Nicene Council taken from the archives of the Roman Pontiffs, because he said the copies that were in Alexandria had been burned up by the Arians.

But this argument is ridiculed by the Magdeburgenses, and really it is not very solid. For, that burning of books occurred at the time of the Emperor Constantine when, Athanasius having been exiled, the Arian Georgius was ordained in his place, as Athanasius himself says in his letter to all the Orthodox; but it is certain from the Chronicle of Jerome that Pope Mark by that time had already died. Then, if Pope Mark sent a copy to Alexandria from the Roman archives, certainly afterwards the Roman copy and the Alexandrian copy would have agreed with each other. Then how did it happen that, in the copy sent by St. Cyril from Alexandria to the Africans, those three canons were missing, which were present in the Roman copy?

Therefore, omitting that letter of Athanasius, it is proved that those canons were not complete. First, because one of the principal canons of the Nicene Council was that Easter should be celebrated on Sunday, as is clear from the letter of Constantine found in book 3 of Eusebius's life of Constantine, from Epiphanius in Heresies 69, and from

Athanasius in the letter on the synods of Ariminum and Seleucia. But that canon is not contained among those 20 in Ruffini.

Secondly: Ambrose teaches in letter 82 that it was decreed at the Council of Nicaea that a bigamist should not be accepted among the clergy; but also this one is not found among those 20 canons.

Thirdly: Jerome in his Preface to the book of Judith says that at the Council of Nicaea the book of Judith was accepted as one of the canonical books; but this is not found among the canons of Ruffini.

Fourthly: Augustine in letter 213 on designating his successor says that at the Council of Nicaea it was forbidden for two bishops to preside in the same Church at the same time and he sadly recalls that he had acted imprudently against this canon; but that canon appears nowhere among the 20.

Fifthly: in the African Council the Fathers say that according to a canon of the Nicene Council one is not allowed to give communion except to those who are fasting; but where is that canon among those 20?

Sixthly: at the end of the Council of Chalcedon Atticus reports that in the Nicene Council the procedure for writing formal documents had been determined; Optatus speaks about this in book 2 against Parmenides, where he says: *With him* (Siricius the Roman Pontiff), *by the correspondence of formal letters» the "whole world is in communion;* and the Council of Mileum in canon 20 forbids the acceptance of clerics unless they have formal documents. But this appears nowhere in those 20 canons of Ruffini.

Seventhly and finally: Luther, Calvin, the Centuriatorians and other heretics passim raise an objection from Socrates in book 1, chapter 8 of his History that there is a canon of the Nicene Council in which they say that priests can have a wife; but that canon is not found among those 20. Therefore, if Zosimus is said to be a corrupter and falsifier of the Nicene canons, because he cited one canon of the Nicene Council which is not found among those 20 canons, for the same reason Constantine, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Atticus, Socrates, the African Fathers, and the Centuriatorians plus Luther and Calvin must be said to be corrupters and falsifiers. For, all of them cite canons of the Nicene Council, which are not found in those 20.

You can add that in session 20 of the Council of Florence a certain learned man named John says that he can show through many testimonies of the old saints that at the Sixth Council of Carthage the Fathers finally admitted that corrupted and falsified canons of the Nicene Council had been sent to them from Alexandria and Constantinople.

I say in the third place that it seems to me quite probable that at the Nicene Council these three canons, which we are considering, were not expressly stated, but that these canons were called such by Zosimus and Boniface, because the Councils of Nicaea and Sardis were considered one and the same thing, and the canons of both councils were joined together in the Roman library, as if they were all from the same council; ignorance of this matter caused confusion among the African Fathers.

The reasons that move me are the following. First, because these canons are had in the same words in the Council of Sardis with which the legates of Zosimus quote them; and it is not probable that the absolutely same canons were in the Nicene Council, and

the Sardian Fathers did not indicate in any way that they did not formulate the canons, but borrowed them. Therefore I think that at the Nicene Council it was implicitly and obscurely decreed that one could appeal to the pontiff, because in fact canon 6 orders the council to observe the ancient customs, and one of them is this one about appeals, as is clear from Leo in letter 89, and from the cited examples, and also because the same council orders that a case once judged can be judged again in another court, as is clear from the letter of Julius as found in Athanasius in Apology 2; however, the Council of Sardis explained the whole matter explicitly and clearly.

Second, because in the Nicene Council translated from the Greek over a thousand years ago, which exists in the monastery of St. Vedastus Atrebatus, are found together with it, as being from the same council, all the canons of the Council of Sardis.

Third, because otherwise a reason cannot be given why the Council of Sardis, which certainly was universal and approved, is not numbered among the general councils. For it should have been called the second Council, but it is not added to the number of councils because it is considered one and the same with the Nicene Council. But the reason why the Council of Sardis was joined together with the Council of Nicaea was because the same Fathers, for the most part, were present at both councils, and nothing new pertaining to the faith was defined in the Sardis Council; there the Nicene faith was only strengthened, since in other councils new heresies were always condemned. Therefore, Zosimus did not cite Nicaea for Sardis out of some kind of deceit, but because they were considered to be the same. I think the same thing should be said about Julius in his letter to the Oriental bishops, about Innocent in the letter to Victricius, and about Leo in the letter to Theodotius, who cite this canon as coming from the Nicene Council. For, just as the Constantinople Creed passim is called the Nicene, because it is an explanation of the Nicene, so also the ancients were accustomed to call the Sardian canons Nicene, which is nothing more than an explanation and confirmation of the Nicene canons.

I add fourthly that the Carthaginian Fathers never decreed that no right in Africa is to be attributed to the Roman Pontiff; or that it was not allowed in any way for the African bishops to appeal to the Roman Church, or that there was great disagreement between the Roman Pontiffs and the African bishops, as Illyricus and Calvin claim. For, first of all, a decree of that kind exists nowhere; then the African Fathers themselves in a letter to Boniface and in another to Celestine openly testify to their harmony and subjection to the apostolic See: for this is what they wrote to Boniface:

Because it seemed good to the Lord that concerning these things which our holy brothers did for us, namely, the fellow bishop Faustinus, and the fellow priests Philip and Asellus, representing bishop Zosimus of blessed memory, from whom they brought to us commands and written instructions, now our humility urges us to write, and we must briefly refer to what they said. It ended with harmony between both of us and, charity being preserved, we have concluded the affair, but not without some difficult discussions.

These are their words. Since there they refer everything to the Pope which was done, and they say that they accepted the commands from Pope Zosimus, do they not say clearly that they acknowledge him as their superior? And in the letter to Celestine they said: *We are sending you our usual greeting, and we urgently beseech you that in the future you*

do not easily listen to those who appeal to you from here. With these words they do not absolutely object to the law about appeals, nor do they say that the Pontiff cannot, if he wishes, accept appeals, but they ask only that in the future he should not easily listen to such appeals.

St. Augustine in letter 157 openly preaches the primacy of the Roman Pontiff in Africa, when he says that from the command of Zosimus he and other bishops went to see Caesar; and when he writes to the whole Christian world that the Pelagian heresy was condemned by Innocent and Zosimus. The same Augustine was subject to Pope Boniface and united with him, as is clear from the beginning of his book against the two letters of the Pelagians and in his letter to Boniface. Augustine also, in letter 261 to Pope Celestine, refers to the Pontiff himself the case of a certain African bishop and among other things he says: *Venerable and bless lord work together with us in your piety, and with the necessary charity, holy Father, order that everything be read to you which has been directed to you.* And after that: *When the apostolic See passes judgment it stands as an example, and it does it also by confirming the judgments of others, etc.* On the other hand, Pope Celestine in a letter to the Gauls gives great praise to Augustine, and he says that he has always remained in communion with the Roman Church, and that he has always been considered by himself and by his predecessors as an excellent teacher.

Thus unity of Augustine with the Roman Church convicts Illyricus of an obvious lie, since he writes that the Roman Pontiffs were opposed by Augustine and his colleagues as falsifiers and wicked corruptors, and were excluded from any authority over Africa.

Not long after that Carthaginian Council, St. Leo in letter 87 writes to the bishops of Mauritania in Africa and says that he has restored communion with bishop Lupicinus, because he had appealed to him from Africa; likewise he says that he has sent bishop Potentius as his legate, who will take care of African affairs in his place. Therefore, either the Carthaginian Council did not forbid it, or certainly those Fathers changed their opinion.

Again, after about 40 years, St. Eugene, the bishop of Carthage, since he was forced by the Arian King Honoricus into a compromise of the faith, responded that he was going to write to his colleagues across the sea; for without the consent of the other bishops and especially of the Roman Church, which is the head of all the Churches, nothing can be determined regarding the faith. Victor of Utica speaks about this in book 2 on the persecution of the Vandals. Therefore the bishop of Carthage, even after the Sixth Council of Carthage, acknowledged that the Roman Church is the head of all the Churches, and if of all of them, certainly also the African; and he did not disagree with the Roman Pontiff, to whom he said he was going to write.

Not long after that, when Trasimundus, successor of Honoricus, sent almost all the African bishops, that is, 220 of them to Sardinia, the Roman Pope Symmachus cared for all those bishops at his own expense, and treated them generously, as deacon Paul writes In book 17 on the Roman affairs. This is certainly an argument not for dissent, but of communion and brotherhood.

At the same time St. Fulgentius, easily the prince of the African bishops, was closely associated with the Roman Church, as is made clear from chapter 12 of his life. For, when

he wanted to go to Egypt to share in the solitude of the monks, he was warned by the bishop of Syracuse not to do it, because all those monks were separated from the See of blessed Peter, with which he was in communion. Therefore, after leaving Egypt he went to Rome to visit the holy places. But the same Fulgentius, as is gathered from chapter 29 of his life which was written faithfully by his disciple, was closely joined together with the Carthaginian Church and its bishop. From this it is clear that also the Carthaginian bishop was in unity with the Roman; for otherwise St. Fulgentius could not rightly have been in communion with two bishops not in communion with each other.

After that time, blessed Gregory clearly declared his union with the Carthaginian bishop, and the right of appeal, and his jurisdiction over all those provinces in book 1, letters 72 and 75, and in book 7, letter 32.

But against this Illyricus raises an objection from the letter of Boniface II to Eulalius, the bishop of Alexandria, and the letter of Eulalius, the bishop of Carthage, to the same Boniface. From these letters it is gathered that, after the Sixth Council of Carthage, for a hundred years the Carthaginian bishops were separated from communion with the Roman Church, and then finally they were reconciled, when Eulalius subjected himself to the apostolic See and anathematized his predecessors.

First, I respond that I strongly suspect the authenticity of those letters. For, in the first place, they seem to be in conflict with what we have said about the union of Augustine, Eugene, Fulgentius, and other Africans with the Roman Church. Then, Eulalius of Alexandria, to whom Boniface seems to have written, certainly at that time he was not there, as is clear from the Chronology of Nicephorus of Constantinople. Moreover, Boniface says in his letter that he had written to the Emperor Justin, but Justin had died before Boniface became Pope, as is certain from all the history books. In addition, the letter which is attributed to Boniface is almost totally composed from two fragments, of which one was taken from the letter of Pope Hormisdas to John, while the other is taken from the letter of St. Gregory to the bishops of Gaul, which is letter 52 in book 4. But St. Gregory at that time had not yet been born; also it is not credible that Gregory borrowed those words from Boniface, since the literary style is totally Gregorian.

For, in the letter which is attributed to the Carthaginian Eulalius a Gregorian sentence is inserted from book 4, letter 36 to Eulogius, and the rest of the letter contains nothing, except a fragment of the letter of John, the bishop of Constantinople, to Pope Hormisdas.

But if by chance those letters are true (I do not admit that) doubtless they are not to be understood in the sense, as if all the predecessors of Eulalius reaching back to Aurelius, the présider of the Carthaginian Council, were separated from communion with the Roman Church. For that contradicts certain and true histories. But they signify only that Aurelius was the first to begin to act in a proud manner against the Roman Church, and then because of his example Eulalius imitated him, and perhaps some others. Moreover, it also means that Eulalius, once he knew truth, subjected himself again in obedience to the Roman Church; for only that can be deduced from those letters.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE FACT THAT THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF IS NOT JUDGED BY ANYONE

The tenth argument is taken from the fact that the Roman Pontiff can be judged by no one on earth. For his primacy cannot be shown more clearly than if he is shown to be a prelate over all so that he is subject to no one. But three points should be noted before we come to the proof.

First, in this place we are not arguing about the pontiff as a temporal prince; for in this way not even the adversaries say that he can be judged in temporal affairs; for it is common to all absolute rulers that they recognize no superior in their temporal affairs. Therefore, we are talking about the Pontiff because of his pontificate alone, and we say that, even if he had no temporal power, he cannot in any way be judged on earth by any Christian prince, whether secular or ecclesiastical, or by all of them assembled together in a Council.

Secondly, it should be observed that there have been two errors concerning this matter. One is the opinion or those who taught that the pontiff can be judged, punished or deposed by the Emperor, if he does not cany out his office properly. Thus formerly Marsilius of Padua in John de Turrecremata in book 4, part 2, chapter 37 of his Sumnu on the Church; the latter refutes this argument at great length in book 2, chapter 93 ff. The second error is that of Nilus in his book on the primacy, for he contends that the pontiff can be judged and punished, not indeed by a secular prince, but by a council of bishops. Then Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 19 in his Institutes and other heretics of this time join together both errors, and they make the Roman Pontiff subject to the judgment both of princes and of bishops.

Thirdly, it should be observed that the main reason why the Pope cannot be judged is because he is the head of the whole Church, and therefore he does not have a superior on earth. For, since he is the supreme ruler of the Church, he cannot be judged by any ecclesiastical authority; and again because the ecclesiastical government is spiritual, and therefore it is greater and more exalted than any temporal republic. On this account the supreme ruler of the Church can direct and judge the supreme ruler of the temporal republic, but he should not be directed or judged by him, unless the right order and the nature of things is overturned. Now this, I say, is the primary reason, and as the philosophers say, it is a priori. However, since this reason assumes what we are tiying to prove in this dispute, namely, that the Roman Pontiff is the ruler of the whole Church, therefore we will pass over these and similar reasons, and we will demonstrate from the testimonies of Councils, pontiffs, emperors, and doctors of the Church that the Roman bishop cannot be judged, and so we will confirm our primaiy thesis, which is, that the Roman Pontiff is the head and ruler of the whole Church.

Therefore, it is proved first of all from the Councils. In the Sinuessan council the Fathers say: *The first See is not judged by anyone.* Nicolas cites these words from that council in his letter to Michael. Likewise, in the Roman council under Sylvester of 280

bishops, in the last canon they say: *The first See is judged neither by Augustus, nor by kings, nor by all the clergy, nor by the people.* The same Nicolas mentions this decree in his letter to Michael. Similarly, in the Roman synod under Sixtus III in chapter 5 we read this: *It is not permitted to pass judgment against the pontiff.* And it is said that Sixtus, who was being accused, responded: *Although it is my decision, whether I am to be judged or not judged, nevertheless let the truth not be hidden.*

Since Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria, in the second council of Ephesus dared to judge and condemn Leo I, the Catholic Church was so astonished by this action that the Council of Chalcedon in letters to Emperors Martianus and Valentinian, and in another letter to Leo, which is found in the third session of the same Council, wrote that they condemned Dioscorus for many reasons, but especially because he presumed to pass judgment on the first See. In Council V under Symmachus the book of deacon Eunodius is found, in which, among other things, this was written: *God wanted the cases of other men to be handled by me, but he reserved to his own decision without question the ruler of this See.*

The Roman council under Pope Adrian II, whose words are quoted in session 7 of Council VIII, says this: *We read that the Roman Pontiff has judged the bishops of all the Churches, but we do not read that anyone has judged him;* this of course must be understood to be about a legitimate judgment. And that Council VIII in session 10, chapter 21, says that it is not permitted for any earthly prince to judge the patriarchs, and especially the Roman. Finally, in the Council of Mileum in canon 19 those clerics are punished severely who want to be judged by the emperor. Therefore, if the emperor could not judge clerics, how much less pontiffs?

Secondly, it is proved from the testimonies of the pontiffs. Gelasius in a letter to Emperor Anastasius said: *There are two, August Emperor, by whom this world is mainly ruled—the sacred authority of the pontiffs and the royal power. Among them the authority of the priests is much more weighty than that of kings, who will have to give an account for their deeds in the judgment of God. Therefore you know that you depend on their judgment, and that they cannot be subject to your will.* Gregory in book 9, letter 39 to Theotistas said: *If the blessed Peter were blamed by the faithful, it would direct attention to the authority which he had received over the holy Church, and he could respond that the sheep should not dare to reprimand their shepherd.* Nicholas I in a letter to Michael said: *It is quite evidently shown that the pontiff cannot be either bound or loosed by the secular power, that is, he can be neither condemned nor forgiven.* Innocent III in a letter to the Emperor teaches the same thing explicitly. Similarly, Boniface VIII said the same thing in the Bull *Unam sanctam;* also John XXII in the Constitution *Licet iuxta doctrinam apostoli.*

Thirdly, it is proved from the confessions of emperors; Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 2 of his History writes about Constantine that he did not wish to judge bishops, but said rather that he should be judged by the bishops. There is a similar confession of the Emperor Basil in the Oration which he gave at the end of Council VIII. And among other things he warns all the laity, in whose order he put himself in the first place, that they should not want to judge judges or to feed their own pastors. Finally, Nicholas in a letter

to Michael proves, from many quoted testimonies, that devout emperors had never given order to pontiffs, but only beseeched them as Fathers, if they wanted to get something from them.

Finally, there are also a few testimonies from the holy doctors. Ambrose in the Oration on the giving up of the Basilicas said: *A good emperor is inside the Church, not over the Church.* Certainly if he is not over the Church, much less is he over the father and pastor of the Church.

Gregory Nazianzen in the Oration in which he excuses himself, because he had absented himself for so long from his ecclesiastical duties, said: *You, as sheep, do not feed the shepherds, and you are not to be raised above boundaries for you. For it is enough for you, if you are rightly cared for, not to judge the judges, and not to make laws for the legislators.* And lest you think that princes are given an exception by Gregory, listen to what the same doctor says in his Oration to citizens struck with fear and to their angiy prince. For here is how he addresses the prince or préside: *Are you willing to accept a free voice? — and that the law of Christ subjects you to my power and my tribunal? For we also command, I add, and with a greater and more perfect authority. Accept, therefore, a more free voice, for I know that you are a sheep of my flock, etc.*

St. Bernard in a letter to the Emperor Conrad said: *By the law every person is subject to the higher authorities. I want you to preserve this idea in showing reverence to the vicar of Peter, as you want it to be observed concerning yourself by the whole empire*

The martyr Boniface in Gratian gives a distinction in canon 40, when speaking about the Roman Pontiff, and he says: *If the Pope is going to judge all, he is to be judged by no one.*

Finally, Hugh of St. Victor in part 2 on the Sacrament said: *The spiritual power judges the earthly; it was instituted first by God, and when is errs, it can be judged only by God.*

CHAPTER XXVII

THE ARGUMENTS OF NILUS ARE REFUTED

Some arguments remain to be refuted. First of Nilus, then of Calvin, and finally, arguments which John of Turrecremata and others have collected from the works of the old heretics.

But before we propose the arguments of Nilus, we think the reader should be warned, lest he put much confidence in the interpretation of Illyricus; for, since both elsewhere, and especially in this matter he distorts the words of Nilus more than once. For an example we can take the beginning of this place. Thus Nilus has, ότι δε παντας ανακρίνων ούτος ύπ'ούδενος ανακρίνεται, τούτο και φευδος, και τοις των αποστόλων ήθεσιν ού συμβαίνει, that is, *But since he judges all, he is judged by no one, and that is false, and it is not in accord with the customs of the apostles.* Illyricus, however, gave this rendition: *What the adversaries babble, namely, that the Pope judges all, but that he should not be judged by anyone, is full of vanity and mendacity, and it disagrees very much with the fair and modest canons of the apostles.* But certainly "babble" is not in the Greek. And what Nilus simply says is false, Illyricus in his eloquence says, *he is full of vanity and mendacity.* Finally, *the customs of the apostles,* the faithful interpreter renders as, *the fair and modest canons of the apostles.* And he does not notice that this conflicts with the following words, for Nilus wants to prove what he had said, namely, that he is reviewing not the canons, but the deeds of the apostles.

But omitting these things, let us consider the reasons of Nilus. First, if Paul, he said, compares his teaching with the apostles, and if Peter, being sharply reprimanded by Paul, endures it patiently, by what right does the Roman Pontiff refuse to render an account to any human beings for his life and conduct?

I respond: he gives this example of Paul for us, since he goes to Peter, and compares the gospel with him, because he acknowledges that Peter is greater than himself, and he wanted to give an example to posterity that they should hasten to the See of Peter in such matters. Those who point this out are Jerome, from among the Latins, in his letter to Augustine, which is 11 among the letters of Augustine, and Theodoretus from among the Greeks in a letter to Leo. In addition, Peter allowed himself to be reprimanded by Paul, because that was not a judicial censure, but fraternal correction. For, as Augustine says in letter 19 to Jerome, and Gregory in homily 18 on Ezekiel, Paul does not reprimand Peter, as superiors judge inferiors with authority, but as inferiors sometimes correct their superiors out of charity.

The second objection. The Roman Pope Honorius was not only judged by the Sixth Council, but he was also condemned.

I respond: in another place we will examine the case of Honorius at length, when we come to the question as to whether a Pope can be a heretic. In the meantime we respond that Honorius in a matter of the faith was judged and condemned (if however it is true what is said about him), and we do not deny that the Church can judge a heretical pontiff. But how that agrees with what we say that a Pope cannot be judged by anyone will become clear in the answer to the last argument.

The third objection. Many laws have been passed about bishops, both by the Apostles and by the Councils, which certainly bind all bishops; but the Pope is a bishop; therefore, he is bound by those laws, and therefore he has a superior by whom he is judged.

I respond: the Pope indeed is bound by ecclesiastical laws, but with regard to direction and not with regard to coercion, as the jurists are wont to speak about a king. Although both general and particular councils sometimes speak generally about bishops, when they make laws, still they should be understood to be for those bishops who are subject to the legislator; this is a point that is very clear from particular councils. Since these councils often say: *If any cleric, if any bishop should do this, etc.,* still it is certain that only the clerics are bound, or the bishops of that province.

The fourth objection. The sixth general Council by name prescribed a law for the Roman Church. For, in canon 13 it reprimands the Roman Church, because it does not allow priests, deacons and sub-deacons to have a wife, and it commands that, in the future, it should be permitted. And in canon 55 it reprimands the same Roman Church, because during Lent there is fasting also on Saturday, and it prescribes that it should no longer be done.

I respond: we have already pointed out that those canons are falsely attributed to the sixth Council, since they were published later by a certain ninth council, which the Roman Pontiffs not only did not approved, but also rejected. On this matter see Francis Turrianus in the book on the sixth Council, and Melchior Cano in book 5 on the last chapter in the answer to argument 6.

Surely those two canons indicate clearly enough the nature of that council. For, in canon 13 they say that they are proposing the teaching of the Apostles and of antiquity, since it allowed clerics to live with a wife. This certainly is false. For, the Council of Carthage II, much more ancient and famous than that false Council VI, says this in canon 2: *It seemed good to all that bishops, priests and deacons, or those who handle the sacraments, as guardians of chastity, should abstain themselves from their wives, so that what the apostles taught, and antiquity also preserved, we also may keep.*

Likewise the Greek Epiphanius, an ancient and approved author, said in Heresies 19, which is on the Catharists: *The Church does not accept a man of one wife still living and generating children, but the man who abstains from his wife or has lived as a widower—a deacon, priests, bishop or sub-deacon, especially where the ecclesiastical canons are in effect. But you will say to me—in some places priests and deacons and sub-deacons are still having children; however, this is not according to the canon, but according to the thinking of men, which in the course of time has become lax.*

But, Nilus said, the sixth Council cites the sixth canon of the apostles, which prescribes that clerics should not send their wife away on the pretext of religion.

I respond: that canon prescribes that clerics, who have a wife, should make adequate provision for her support; but they should not have marital relations with her. Nilus cannot reject this explanation, both because the synod of Trulla in canon 48 explains the same canon in this way, and also because otherwise the same apostolic canon will conflict with those Trullian canons, whose authority is opposed by us. For, the canon of the apostles prescribes not only for minor clerics, but also for bishops that they should not put away

their wives; however, the Trullian canons permit marital relations for minor clerics, but they do not permit it for bishops. But elsewhere there will be more said about this.

But what pertains to the canon on the Sabbath fast, since the matter is indifferent, and each region can have its own custom, as Jerome teaches in a letter to Lucinius Boeticus, and Augustine in letter 86 to Casulanus, a council of the Greeks must not and cannot impose a law of this kind on the Latins. You can add to this what Innocent I says in letter 1; he teaches that one should fast on Saturday, and also what the Greek Epiphanius says, who in his compendium on doctrine makes an exception only for Sundays during the Lenten fast.

But canon 65 of the apostles forbids fasting on the Sabbath. I respond that that canon is not genuine; for, the Church has received only 50 canons from the apostles, as Cardinal Humbert testifies in the book against Nicetas, and it is also found in Gratian in distinction 16. Then, if the apostles really prescribed that, certainly they ordered it in opposition to the heretics, who fasted on the Sabbath, lest they seem to honor the Creator, who rested on the seventh day. Therefore, since that heresy is now extinct, it is now allowed to fast on Saturday; and it is not only allowed, but it is also a pious custom, because of the memorial of the Lord's burial, and to separate us further from Judaism.

In the fifth place Nilus makes two objections to our answer. First, because even if those canons were not legitimate, still reason itself clearly teaches that the Pope can be judged. For, all bishops, as bishops, are equal, as is clear from Dionysius, who says that all of them are of the same order and dignity; but the Pope is nothing more than a bishop, as is certain both because he is ordained by bishops, and because Dionysius recognizes in the ecclesiastical hierarchy no dignity greater than the episcopal. Therefore the Pope is bound by the laws of Councils and can be judged just like the other bishops.

Secondly, because it may be demonstrated in many ways that those canons are legitimate and come from a general Council. First of all, because the council that established those canons is the sixth council renewed and continued; for, the same Fathers, who gathered together in the beginning to explain the faith, came together later to establish these canons. Second, because in this council the legation of the Roman Pontiff was not lacking, since Gortynae, a bishop in Crete, took the place of the Roman Pontiff, as can be seen from the history of Basil. Third, because the council which established these canons calls itself a general council, it is not credible that so many Fathers wanted to lie. Fourth, because the seventh council in canon 1 accepted the six canons of the general councils, and the sixth council had no other canons but those. Fifth, because Pope Adrian in a letter to Tharasius praises him with admiration, because he constantly observed these decrees with his own people, and by name he cites canon 82, from which it follows that these canons were also confirmed by the Roman Pontiff himself.

I respond that the first reason about the equality of bishops proves absolutely nothing. For, bishops are equal by reason of their ordination, as Dionysius says, but not by reason of jurisdiction. Thus even Nilus himself in the same book says that the bishop of Constantinople has much more authority than the bishop of Caesarea and the other bishops who are subject to the See of Constantinople. Then the Sovereign Pontiff cannot be judged because he has a dignity or ordination greater than the episcopal, but because

he has a greater episcopal jurisdiction, so that he presides over all and is subject to no one. And those arguments do not really prove that the Trullian canons are legitimate.

To the first point I respond that this council cannot be said to be the sixth one renewed and continued; for, the same council presiders were not there, nor the same Emperor, nor the same number of bishops. For, in the sixth truly general council the Emperor Constantine was present, likewise the legates of Pope Agatho, and 289 bishops, as we have in the sixth Council in session 3; but at the time of that pseudo-sixth council, the legates of Pope Agatho and the Emperor Constantine were not ρΓβ5βηζ and there were only 227 bishops.

Moreover, at the beginning of the pseudo-sixth council they say in a certain way they are renewing the fifth and sixth councils; and therefore Theodore Balsamon calls this council not so much the sixth one as the "five and six" council *(quinisextum).* But how could this council be said or believed to be the fifth one renewed, since absolutely no one from the fifth council was present at it? Indeed, between the fifth council and the "five and six" council there were more than 130 years. Finally, to what purpose were the fifth and sixth councils renewed, and not rather a new council called? Because, they said, those councils did not establish canons. But they did not want of make canons, since they had been assembled not to establish canons, but to explain the faith.

To the second point I respond: Who that bishop Gortynae was, and who gave him the place of the Roman Pope in the council, Nilus may know; but that he mentions this name, and that he cites a history that is absolutely unknown, by some Basil or other, does not lack a certain suspicion of falsity. But aside from that, we know for certain that this council was rejected as erroneous by Pope Sergius, who was reigning at the time, as is testified to by Bede on the six ages concerning Justinian the Younger, by Deacon Paul in book 6, chapter 4 on the deeds of the Langobards, Otto Frisingensis in book 5, chapter 13, Ado of Vienne, Marianus Scotus, and Rhegino in the Chronicle, where he speaks about Justinian the Younger.

But that this council which Sergius rejected is the same one that established those canons is clear from Tharasius and Epiphanius, who say in sessions 4 and 6 of the seventh Council that five years after the sixth Council the Fathers assembled again, and established these canons. Also at that time it is certain that Sergius was the reigning Pope. And there is no memory of the council celebrated at that time; we will deal with this question more at length in the book on councils.

Furthermore, the librarian Anastasius in the preface to the sixth Council writes that these canons are not to be found, either among the Roman Pontiffs, or among any of the patriarchs, with the exception of Constantinople. From this he rightly concludes that that council was not assembled by the authority of the Roman Pontiff or of the other patriarchs. Finally, Cardinal Humbert, legate of Leo IX, in a book against the Greeks says that those same canons not only were not accepted by the apostolic See, but also he calls them openly absurdities.

To the third point I respond: It is not surprising if those Fathers apply to themselves a falsely devised title, since they call themselves a general Council, they know that they cannot prescribe law of any kind for the Roman Church, unless they falsely claim that

they are a general Council. Then, since in canon 2 they accept the synod held under Cyprian, which openly was judged by the whole Church to be erroneous, and in canon 19 they openly lie in saying that living with a wife is permitted for priests because of an apostolic constitution, and they contain many other manifestly false things, why is there any surprise if they also lie in the title?

To the fourth point I respond: Since in the seventh Council the canons are accepted from the six general Councils, under the name of canons not only canons about morals are understood, but canons generally, whether they were established concerning morals or the faith; for, all the Councils, in this sense, established canons. But only the Nicene Council established canons in the proper sense concerning morals and ecclesiastical discipline. For, the second and fourth Councils did indeed establish some canons, but they were not approved by the apostolic See, as is certain from session 16 of the Council of Chalcedon; therefore they cannot properly be said to be canons of the general Councils. And the third, fifth and sixth Councils established absolutely no canons concerning morals.

To the fifth point I respond that Tharasius was commended by Adrian, because he saw that he was defending the true faith according to the six general Councils; but what is contained in the letter of Adrian about these canons of the "five and six" council, is recounted in the letter of Tharasius, and although in that place it is not rejected by Adrian, because the time was not ripe for doing it, still it is not immediately approved. But what Adrian did not do, afterwards Nicholas did in his letter to Michael where, since he wants to cite one of these canons, he says that he learned from the Apostle, even to use the testimonies of the pagans when it was necessary.

Finally, in the sixth place Nilus objects that it is intolerable that the Roman Pope refuses to be subject to the canons of the holy Fathers, since he had his dignity from the Fathers, and he also published many canons; he also said the Pope is unworthy because, being honored as the Father, he despises so many holy Fathers.

I respond that those reasons prove that the Pope cannot be subject to those canons, for he did not get his dignity from the Fathers, but from Christ, a was demonstrated above; therefore he must be subject to Christ, not to the Fathers. Then, since he himself establishes canons, this is a sign that he is the ruler and legislator, but the ruler cannot be bound by his own laws, since he is not superior to himself, and laws are passed only by a superior for his inferiors. Finally, if he is honored by all as their Father, he does not have other Fathers in the Church, but all are his sons. But what is surprising in this, if the father is not subject to the sons, but the sons to their father? You can add to this that the Pope does not despise the Fathers or their canons, although he cannot be bound by them, but he also uses them, as a source of guidance, and he orders that they be observed by others.

CHAPTER XXVIII

CALVIN'S OBJECTIONS ARE REFUTED

Indeed Calvin, where he rejects what we are saying, that is, that the pontiff is judged by no one, actually in book 4, chapter 7 § 19, 20 and 21 presents no argument pertaining to this matter, but merely says that many facts can be gathered from the councils, from histories, and from the writings of the old authors, according to which the Roman Pontiffs are subject to others. In the meantime, however, from such an abundance of testimonies it did not seem necessary to him to quote any of them.

But what pertains to the name of the supreme priest and universal bishop will be handled in a following chapter. In another place, however, namely in book 4, chapter 11 § 12 Calvin cites some texts of St. Gregory who, since he was the Roman bishop, still he recognized the Emperor as his lord. For, in book 3, letter 61, he calls himself truly the unworthy servant of his serene lord and emperor. And in the same place he confesses sincerely that he owes him obedience. Likewise in book 4, letter 31 he said: *Our lord considers himself unworthy in reference to priests, not because of earthly power, but from a lofty consideration of the one whom they serve; he is ruled by them so that he shows them due reverence.* In this place Gregory is speaking about himself, and he numbers himself among those over whom he says that the Emperor rules. Likewise in letter 34: *I trust in almighty God that he will grant a long life to devout lords, and that he will deal with us under your hand according to his mercy.*

I respond: That St. Gregory calls himself a servant of the Emperor should not seem astonishing; for, as Deacon John writes in book 4, chapter 58 of his life, he called all priests his brothers, all clerics his sons, all lay people his lords. However, it is not right to deduce from this that Gregory could be judged by all the laity. But in what pertains to obedience and subjection, because of his humility he said he was a servant of the Emperor, and he accepted requests from him as orders and commands. And it is not opposed to the common way of speaking when we say that we obey someone, when we do what another person wants, even though he does not command it, and perhaps cannot command it.

You can add that Gregory not without good reason spoke so humbly with the Emperor, since at that time the Emperor was the temporal ruler of the city of Rome, and Gregory veiy much needed his help and friendship, in order that he and the temporal goods of the Church and the Roman people would be defended against the swords and rage of the Langobards. Also in the administration of the temporal republic itself the Emperor, who was far away, made much use of the help of Gregory, which can be seen in the quoted letters; and certainly concerning the things that Gregoiy did in the name of the Emperor he was bound to give an account to the same Emperor.

Absolutely, however, if we compare person with person, the Emperor was a sheep, the pontiff the shepherd; therefore the pontiff should judge the Emperor, and the pontiff should not be judged by the Emperor, which is easily deduced from the fact that devout pontiffs often judged devout emperors, as Fabian judged Philip, Ambrose Theodotius,

Innocent Arcadius. But nowhere devout emperors are said to have judged devout pontiffs or to have given them commands, as Nicholas in his letter to Michael proves with much evidence. Gregory knew this very well and was not silent about it; for, in book 4, letter 31 which Calvin cites, although he says he is a servant of the Emperor, nevertheless he adds that the Emperor should show reverence to the priests; this certainly is a certain sign of an inferior, not of a superior. In the same place he offers the example of Constantine, who did not dare to judge bishops, even when they desired it and asked for it. Gregory really never would have cited this example, if he believed that a pontiff should be judged by the Emperor.

Finally, in the same place when Gregory was called "simple" by the Emperor, he did not remain silent that a grave injury had been done to him by that word, since "simple" and "foolish" seem to signify the same thing. But, I ask, how great would the injuiy be, if a lord should call his servant, and a judge should call an accused person "simple"? Therefore, St. Gregory understood what role he had in the Church, and what reverence was due to him from the Emperor, although in the meantime he subjected himself to him partly out of humility, partly out of necessity. See letters 47 and 44 in book 11 and the explanation of the same St. Gregory in his comments on Psalm 102, which is one of the penitential Psalms, and you will see that Mauritius ruled in a tyrannical way, and that the obedience, which Gregory showed towards him, was forced from him and was not owed to him.

CHAPTER XXIX

ANOTHER NINE ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

Now we will consider nine arguments, which John of Turrecremata and others have distilled from the works of the old heretics. The first argument. The Lord Jesus Christ himself acknowledged imperial power over himself, since he says to Pilate in John 19:10: *You would have no power over me unless it had been given to you from above.* Therefore much more should the Roman Pontiff, who calls himself the Vicar of Christ, be subject to the imperial power. This is confirmed from St. Augustine in his comments on this text, where he teaches openly that the power of Pilate over Christ was from God, according to this saying of the Apostle: *There is no authority except from God* (Rom. 13:1). Likewise from Bernard, who in letter 42 to Bishop Henry of Sens said: *Say, if you dare, that God does not know the ordination of your ruler, since Christ also admits that the power of the Roman governor over himself was ordained in heaven.*

I respond that Christ without doubt was not subject *de iure* to any man, since he is God and the Son of God, but that he willingly subjected himself to the judgment of Pilate for our sake; he did not grant him any authority over himself, but he humbly tolerated the power he had over himself actually, not according to justice. Matthew shows this in 17:24-27; for, when Jesus is asked to pay the tax, he said first of all that he was not bound to do so, and then he ordered it to be paid so he would not give offense.

To that saying in John 19:11 two responses can be given. First, with Cyril and Chiysostom in comments on this text we say that the Lord is talking not about the power of jurisdiction, but about the divine permission, without which not even sins can be committed, so that the meaning is: *You would not be able to do anything to me, unless God permitted it;* concerning that kind of power the statement in Luke 22:53 is also understood: *This is your hour, and the power of darkness.*

But you will object: If the Lord is speaking about permission, why does he immediately add: *Therefore he who delivered me to you has the greater sin.* Did God permit Pilate to pass judgment against Christ, and he did not permit the Jews to hand him over to Pilate, and still they did it contrary to God's will, and therefore they sinned more? I respond that the latter sentence follows very well from the prior one, since the Lord, when he says "therefore," is not giving the reason only why the Jews sinned more than Pilate, but also why Pilate himself sinned, although less than the Jews. Therefore this is the meaning of those words: Since it is not a requirement of justice, but only because God permits you to crucify me, on this account you indeed are sinning, but he is sinning more who handed me over to you not out of justice, but because of hatred.

A second explanation is that of Augustine and Bernard who say that Christ is talking about a true power of jurisdiction, according to which opinion those words agree well with what preceded them: *Therefore he who delivered me to you has the greater sin.* For this is the meaning: You are crucifying me, because you are afraid of offending Caesar, from whom you have your power; and you are indeed sinning, because you should obey God rather than men. However, Judas, who delivered me to you, is sinning more, because

he is crucifying me not out of fear of a superior power, but because of hatred and envy.

And although the first explanation seems to be more literal, still also the second one is not opposed to our thesis. For, Pilate is said to have had power over Christ, and really he did have it, not essentially, but accidentally. For, essentially he had power over all the Jews, who were subject to the Roman Empire; then the Lord was presented to him as one individual from the number of Jewish private persons; therefore he had power over him as presented to him in this way. For, although Pilate suspected that Christ is the Son of God, still he did not judge him as the Son of God, but as a private Jewish person. A similar case in our time would be that of a cleric wearing secular clothes who comes before a judge to be tried; the judge could exercise his authority over him, and he would be excused from any guilt, if his ignorance is truly probable.

The second argument. Paul in Acts 25:10 appeals to Caesar: *I am standing before Caesar's tribunal, where I ought to be tried.* And after that: *I appeal to Caesar.* If Paul acknowledged Caesar as his judge, certainly also Peter does the same; for, Peter and Paul were equals.

I respond that Paul appealed to Caesar, since *de facto* he was his judge, even if not *de iure.* For this is the response given by John of Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 96 in his Summa on the Church.

Secondly, it can be added that he appealed to Caesar not as superior to the Jewish authority, from which he received the injury, for he could not otherwise free himself from that unjust judgment except by appealing to a higher authority, and he himself refers to this when he says in Acts 28:19 that he was compelled to appeal to Caesar.

The third argument. Paul in Rom. 13:1 says: *Let every person be subject to the governing authorities.* And Peter says in 1 Pet. 2:13: *Be subject for the Lord's sake to every human creature, whether it be to the emperor as supreme, etc.* In these places they are speaking about the secular powers, and no one is exempt from subjection—not a cleric, not a bishop, not the Pope, since he says: *Let every person be subject.* And it cannot be responded that the apostles are speaking only about the officials of their time who were pagans. For, the Church, which always repeats these readings, with sufficient clarity indicates that Paul and Peter are speaking about all public officials, who existed then and will exist in the future.

I respond that both Peter and Paul are speaking in general, and are exhorting all subjects to obey their superiors, both spiritual and temporal. From this view it cannot be deduced that the Pope is subject to the king, but only that he who is subject owes obedience to his superior.

That those views are general is now proved; for Paul says: *Let every person be subject to the governing authorities.* There he does not restrict the idea to the secular authority, but he is talking about every authority. And the example of kings who bear the sword is not opposed to this; for, Paul wanted to speak about the king more clearly and more carefully, because at that time Christians were being accused of sedition and rebellion by calumniators. Therefore, at the end he concludes in a general way: *Pay all of them their dues, revenue to whom revenue is due, respect to whom respect is due, honor to whom honor is due.* Peter also speaks in a general way: *Be subject,* he said, *to every*

human creature, that is, to every creature having authority, although immediately he gives an example concerning the king, and other officials, for the same reason that Paul gives. Therefore, St. Bernard (as we cited above) in letter 183 to Emperor Conrad said: *Concerning the law, "let every person be subject to the governing authorities," I want you to observe this rule in showing reverence to the vicar of Peter, just as you want it to be observed towards yourself by the whole empire.*

The fourth argument. In the Old Law the king judged, and deposed the high priest, for Solomon in 1 Kings 2:27 deposed Abiathar, and put Zadok in his place; similarly, therefore, in the New Testament it will be the right of the Christian emperor to judge the Christian pontiff.

I respond: First, the similitude can be denied, for since in the Old Testament the promises were only temporal, and in the New they are spiritual and eternal, as is taught by Jerome in book 1 against the Pelagians and in the letter to Dardanus on the promised land, and by Augustine in question 33 on the book of Numbers 19 against Faustus, it is not surprising, if in the Old Testament the supreme authority was temporal, and in the New Testament it is spiritual.

Secondly, I say that also in the Old Testament the high priest was greater than the king, as is taught by Philo in the book on victims, by Theodoretus in question 1 on Leviticus, and by Procopius in comments on Lev. 4, and it is both deduced from Num. 27, where it is said that at the word of Eleazar, both the leader Joshua and all the people shall go out and shall come in, and from Lev. 4, where four sacrifices are instituted, from the order and magnitude of which the order and dignity of the persons is gathered, for whom they are made. First, there was a young bull for the high priest. Second, there was also a young bull for all the people. Third, a male goat for the king. Fourth, a female goat for any private person.

To the words of Solomon I say that he deposed Abiathar and replaced him with Zadok not as king, but as a prophet and executor of divine justice. For, in the same place in 1 Kings 2 Solomon is said to have removed Abiathar *in order to fulfill the word of the Lord, etc.*

The fifth argument. Christian emperors often judged and deposed pontiffs. For, Constantius sent Pope Liberius into exile; Justinian exiled Sylvester; King Theodoric put John 1 in prison, Otto I deposed John XII and put Leo VIII in his place. Henry III deposed Gregory VI and ordered Clement II to be ordained. The histories of those times give full coverage to all these events.

I respond: Indeed these things happened, but by what right is another question. Certainly Athanasius testifies in his letter on leading a solitary life that Liberius was unjustly driven into exile. Liberatus says the same thing about Sylvester in chapter 22 of the Breviarium. St. Gregory reports about John I in book 4, chapter 30 of the Dialogue, and it is certain that Constantius and Theodoric were Arians, and that Justinian was a Eutychian. Therefore it is not more surprising that heretical princes deposed Christian pontiffs in a tyrannical way, than that the pagan Emperors killed them passim.

From Otto I it is quite certain that John XII was deposed out of a sense of holy zeal, but not according to good knowledge; for, of all the pontiffs that John was perhaps

the worst. And so it is not surprising, if a pious emperor, such as Otto I was, but less experienced in ecclesiastical affairs, judged that he could depose him, especially since many doctors were of the same mind. Therefore, Otto Frisingensis in book 6, chapter 23 where he presents this history, moderately reproaches the Emperor with these words: *Whether or not he did it licitly, at this time it cannot be said.* You can add that Otto did not properly depose the pontiff, but he had it done by a council of bishops; that council was not so much a council as it was a brother, and so shortly thereafter it was abrogated, as Cardinal Baronius proves from the histories of that time in volume 10 of the Annals.

Concerning Henry III there is less difficulty, for as is certain from the same Otto Frisingensis in book 6, chapter 32, Emperor Henry did not depose Gregory VI, but persuaded him to resign, because he seemed to have become pontiff by simony; so when he freely resigned, Clement was elected. Moreover, Leo Hostiensis, who lived at that time, in book 2, chapter 80 of the Cassinese Chronicle, adds that a council of bishops was convened, and that the pontiff was invited by the Emperor to preside over the council, so that, although the case of the pontiff himself was being examined, still he himself was the supreme judge. But being very contrite, he asked for pardon of his errors, and of his own will he abdicated the pontificate.

The sixth argument. The pontiffs themselves admit that they are subject to the emperors. For, Gregory in Gratian in canon *Si quis* 2, question 7 said: *If anyone wants to refute us concerning these matters, let him come to the apostolic See, so that there before the confession of St. Peter he can justly contend with me, seeing that one of us there will receive his decision.* Likewise, Pope Adrian I conceded to Charlemagne the right of choosing the Roman Pontiff, and of arranging the apostolic See, as is found in dist. 63 can. of Adrian. A long time afterwards again Leo VIII conceded the same right to Otto I, as is reported in the same dist. 63 can. in the council. Likewise, Leo IV asked for judges from Emperor Louis, and he promised to obey their decision, as is contained in the canon *Nos si incompetenter* 2, q. 7.

I respond: That statement of Gregoiy is not found in his works. Then, Gregory is not appealing to the judgment of men, but of God. For, he seems to be speaking about a debate concerning an oath and about the expectation of a divine decision, which is brought often immediately against perjurers. Adrian and Leo conceded to the Emperor only that he could confirm or reject the election of a new pontiff, and organize the Roman Church concerning temporal affairs; from this it does not follow that he had power over the pontiff. And those two privileges conceded to the Emperor because of the frequent schisms of the time, and because of the continuing hostility of the Langobard and Greek enemies, who were constantly harassing the Roman Church, were revoked once the hostilities ceased. There is also the fact that those canons do not seem to be legitimate, since Gratian collected them from no other source but from the simple narration of the historian Sigebert, and the contrary is proved from the custom of that time as Cardinal Baronius demonstrates in volume 4 of the Annals. Leo IV subjected himself to the discretionary judgment of the Emperor, not the coactive, as is easily deduced from the same chapter.

The seventh argument. It is allowed for each person to kill the pontiff, if he is unjustly

attacked by him. Therefore, much more will it be allowed for kings or a council to depose a pontiff, if he upsets the republic, or he tends to kill souls by his bad example.

I respond by denying the consequence, because in order to resist an attacker and to defend oneself no authority is needed. And it is not necessary that the one who is attacked is the judge or superior of the one attacking him; but authority is required in order to judge and punish. Therefore, just as it is permitted to resist a pontiff attacking the body, so it is permitted to resist anyone attacking souls, or upsetting the republic, or much more if he is trying to destroy the Church. It is permitted, I say, to resist him by not doing what he commands, or by hindering the accomplishment of his will. However, but it is not permitted to judge, or punish, or depose him, which can be done only by his superior. On this matter see Cajetan in the treatise on the authority of pope and council in chapter 27. And John de Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 106.

The eighth argument. The pontiff is truly subject to his confessor in the internal forum as a minister of God. Therefore, why can he not be subject in the exterior forum to some prince, who is also a minister of God?

I respond: The reason here is different, because in the internal forum of the conscience the confessor is a mere instrument of God, so that God is judging through the man, rather than the man himself. This is evident, both because the confessor cannot force the penitent to assume a penance if he is totally unwilling, and because in confession he is judged also concerning hidden and secret crimes, which pertain to the knowledge of God alone. But in the external forum man is a true judge, even as a man, although he has been appointed by God; and therefore he judges only about manifest crimes, and he can impose a punishment on those who are totally unwilling to accept it.

The ninth argument. A pontiff can give a letter of repudiation to his spouse the Church by renunciation, as is clear from Sextus in chapter 1 on Renunciation; therefore the Church also can give a letter of dismissal to her spouse the pontiff, and choose another one.

I respond first of all by denying the consequence. For, the pontiff is over the Church, not vice versa. Hence also in Deut. 24:1 a man could give a bill of divorce to his wife, but that the wife could give a bill of divorce to her husband is not read anywhere. Secondly I say that the pontiff cannot renounce the pontificate without the consent of the Church; and therefore if the Church could give a notice of repudiation to a pontiff, it could not do it without his consent; so when he consented, he would be abdicating according to his own will, and is not forced unwillingly.

CHAPTER XXX

THE LAST ARGUMENT IS REFUTED, AND THE QUESTION IS TREATED: WHETHER A HERETICAL POPE CAN BE DEPOSED

The tenth argument. A pontiff in the case of heresy can be judged and deposed by the Church, as is clear in dist. 40 can. *Si papa;* therefore the pontiff is subject to a human judgment, at least in this one case.

I respond: On this matter there are five opinions. The first is that of Albert Pighius in book 4, chapter 8 on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, where he contends that the Pope cannot be a heretic; therefore he cannot be deposed in any case; this opinion is probable, and can easily be defended, as we shall show later in the proper place. However, because this opinion is not certain, and the common opinion is contrary to it, it will be worth the effort to see what response should be given, if there can be a heretical Pope.

Therefore there is a second opinion that a Pope by the very fact that he falls into heresy, even if it is only interior, is outside the Church and deposed by God; therefore he can be judged by the Church, that is, declared deposed by divine right, and deposed de facto, if he still refuses to submit. This is the view of John of Turrecremata in book 4, part 2, chapter 20, but in my opinion it is not proved. For, jurisdiction surely is given by God to the pontiff, but with the cooperation of human activity, as is clear, for that man who before was not Pope has acquired from men that he begin to be Pope; therefore it is not taken from God except through men. But an occult heretic cannot be judged by men, and of his own will he does not want to relinquish that authority. In addition, the foundation of this opinion is that occult heretics are outside the Church, and we have shown abundantly that this is false in book 1 on the Church.

The third opinion goes to the opposite extreme, namely, that a Pope neither by occult heresy, nor by manifest heresy is deposed or can be deposed. Turrecremata in the place noted mentions and refutes this opinion, and surely it is very improbable. First, that a heretical Pope can be judged is contained expressly in the canon *Si papa* dist. 40, and in Innocent in sermon 2 on the consecration of a pontiff. And even more, the acts of the Roman Council under Adrian are contained in the 7th session of the eighth general Council, and it is contained there that Pope Honorius seems to have been justly anathematized, because he was convicted of heresy; this is the only reason because of which it is permitted for inferiors to judge superiors. There it should be noted that although it is probable that Honorius was not a heretic, and that Pope Adrian II, having been deceived by corrupt copies of the acts of Council VI, falsely thought that Honorius was a heretic; nevertheless, we cannot deny that Adrian with the Roman Council, and indeed the whole general Council VIII, thought that in a case of heresy the Roman Pontiff could be judged. You can add that it would be a miserable situation for the Church, if she were forced to acknowledge as her shepherd a manifestly raging wolf.

The fourth opinion is that of Cajetan in the treatise on the authority of Pope and Council, in chapters 20 and 21, where he teaches that a manifest heretical Pope is not by that very fact deposed, but that he can be and should be deposed by the Church. According

to my judgment this opinion cannot be defended. For, first of all, that a manifest heretic is deposed ipso facto is proved by authority and reason. The authority is St. Paul, who in his letter to Titus 3:10-11 orders that a heretic after two rebukes, that is, after he manifestly appears obstinate, is to be avoided, and he understands this to be before any excommunication and sentence of a judge; as Jerome writes in the same place, where he says that other sinners, through a sentence of excommunication, are excluded from the Church; they leave per se and are cut off from the body of Christ. But the Pope remaining Pope cannot be avoided, for how can we avoid our head? How can we abandon a member joined to us?

But this reason is most certain. A non-Christian cannot in any way be Pope, as Cajetan says in chapter 26 of the same book, and the reason is because what is not a member cannot be the head; and he who is not a Christian is not a member of the Church. But a heretic manifestly is not a Christian, as Cyprian teaches openly in book 4, letter 2, Athanasius in sermon 2 against Arians, Augustine in chapter 20 of his book on the grace of Christ, Jerome against the Luciferians, and others; therefore a manifest heretic cannot be the Pope.

Cajetan responds in the Apology, in chapter 22 and 25, that a heretic is not a Christian simply, but he is a Christian in a certain respect. For, since two things make a Christian, faith and the character, a heretic who has lost the faith still belongs to the Church in some way, and is capable of jurisdiction; therefore he is still the Pope, but he should be deposed, because through heresy he is disposed, by a final disposition, to not be Pope; such indeed is the state of a man who is not actually dead, but at the point of death.

But that is not right. For, first of all, if by reason of the character a heretic remained actively joined to the Church, he could never be cut off and separated from her actually, because the character is indelible; but all admit that some persons can be cut off de facto from the Church; therefore the character does not make a heretical man to be actually in the Church, but it is only a sign that he was in the Church, and that he should be in the Church. Therefore a brand burned on a sheep, when it wanders away in the mountains, does not place it in the flock, but it indicates from which flock he ran away, and where he can be forced to return. And this is confirmed by St. Thomas in III, q. 8, a. 3, where he says that those who lack faith are not united to Christ actually, but only potentially; there he is speaking about internal union, not external, which takes place through confession of the faith and the visible sacraments. Therefore, since the character pertains to the internal and not to the external according to St. Thomas, the character alone does not unite a man actually with Christ.

Next, faith is either a necessary disposition simply so that someone can be Pope, or only for him to do it well. If the first position, then if that disposition is lost by its contrary which is heresy, immediately he ceases to be Pope; for the form cannot be sustained without the necessary dispositions. If the second position, then the Pope cannot be deposed because of heresy; for otherwise he would have to be deposed because of ignorance or depravity and similar things, which remove knowledge and probity and the other dispositions necessary to be a good Pope.

Cajetan responds that faith is a necessary disposition simply, but partial, not total;

and therefore, if faith is lost, that the Pope still remains Pope because of the other part of the disposition, which is called the character, and it still remains.

But on the contrary. Either the total disposition, which is the character and faith, is necessary simply, or it is not, but a partial disposition suffices. If the first position, then if faith is lost, the necessary disposition simply does not remain any longer, because the whole was necessaiy simply, and now it is no longer total. If the second alternative, then faith is not required except to be a good Pope, and so because of its absence the Pope cannot be deposed. Then those who have the ultimate disposition for death, shortly thereafter cease to be without any other external power, as is clear. Therefore, a heretical Pope, without another disposition, per se ceases to be Pope.

Finally, the holy Fathers harmoniously teach that not only are heretics outside the Church, but also by that very fact lack all jurisdiction and ecclesiastical dignity. Cyprian in book 2, letter 6 said: *We say that absolutely all heretics and schismatics have no power and jurisdiction.* And he teaches in book 2, letter 1 that heretics returning to the Church are to be received as lay persons, although before in the Church they were priests or bishops. Optatus in book 1 against Parmenides teaches that heretics and schismatics do not have the keys to the kingdom of heaven, and that they can neither bind nor loose. Ambrose in book 1, chapter 2 on penance and Augustine in chapter 65 of the Enchiridion say the same. Jerome teaches in the book against the Luciferians: *Not that they who had been heretics could be bishops, but because it was clear that those who were received had not been heretics.*

Pope Celestine I in his letter to John of Antioch, which is found in the Council of Ephesus, volume I, chapter 19: *If anyone,* he said, *has been excommunicated or deprived of his dignity of bishop or priest by bishop Nestorius or by others who follow him, from whom they began to preach such things, it is obvious that he remains in communion with us, and we do not judge that he has been separated from us, because the decision of someone, who had already proved that he should be removed, cannot remove anyone.* And in a letter to the clergy of Constantinople he said: *The authority of our See has ordered that no bishop or cleric or Christian of any profession, who by Nestorius or his followers, from whom they began to preach such things, has been removed from his place or communion, is to be considered separated or excommunicated, because the one who erred, while teaching such things, cannot remove or excommunicate anyone.* Nicholas I repeats and confirms the same thing in his letter to Michael. Finally, also St. Thomas in II-II, q. 39, a. 3 teaches that schismatics immediately lose all jurisdiction, and that their acts are invalid, if they try to do something involving jurisdiction.

Now what certain persons respond to this is invalid, namely, that those Fathers are speaking according to antique laws, but now, because of a decree of the Council of Constance, they do not lose jurisdiction, unless they are excommunicated by name and attackers of clerics. This, I say, is invalid, because those Fathers, when they say that heretics lose jurisdiction, are not citing any human laws, and perhaps none existed at that time concerning this matter, but they are arguing from the nature of heresy. But the Council of Constance is speaking only about excommunicated persons, that is, about those who by a decree of the Church have lost jurisdiction. But heretics, even before

excommunication, are outside the Church, and are deprived of all jurisdiction, for they are condemned by their own judgment, as the Apostle teaches in Tit. 3:10, that is, cut off from the body of the Church without excommunication, as Jerome explains it.

Then what Cajetan says in the second place, namely, that a heretical Pope can be deposed by the Church truly and from authority, seems to be not less false than the first proposal. For, if the Church deposes a Pope against his will, certainly it is above the Pope, whose opposite the same Cajetan defends in that tractate. But he responds that the Church from the fact that it deposes a Pope does not have authority over the Pope, but only over the connection of the person with the pontificate. For, as the Church can join the pontificate with such a person, but it is not said on that account to be over the pontiff, so it can separate the pontificate from such a person in the case of heresy, and still it is not said to be over the pontiff.

But that is not correct. For, first of all, from the fact that a Pope deposes bishops, they conclude that the Pope is above all bishops, and still a Pope deposing a bishop does not destroy the episcopate, but only separates it from that person. Secondly, to be deposed unwillingly from the pontificate without doubt is a punishment. Therefore, the Church deposing a Pope against his will without doubt is punishing him; but to punish is the quality of a superior or judge. Thirdly, because, according to Cajetan and other Thomists a whole and the parts taken together are the same thing in reality, therefore the one who has authority in parts taken together, so that he could separate them, also has that whole thing, which is composed out of those parts.

Also, Cajetan's example is not valid about the electors, who have the power of giving the pontificate to a certain person, and still do not have power over the Pope. For, while something is coming into being, action is exercised over the matter of the future thing, not over the composite which does not yet exist; but when a thing is destroyed, it is exercised over the composite, as is clear in natural things. Therefore the Cardinals, while they are creating a pontiff, are exercising their authority, not over the pontiff because he does not yet exist, but over the matter, that is, over the person whom by the election they in a certain way dispose, so that he may receive from God the form of the pontificate. But if they depose a pontiff, necessarily they are exercising authority over the composite, that is, over the person endowed with the pontifical dignity, that is, over the pontiff.

Therefore the fifth opinion is true, namely, that a manifestly heretical Pope per se ceases to be Pope and Head, just as per se he ceases to be a Christian and member of the body of the Church. Therefore he can be judged by the Church and punished. This is the opinion of all the old Fathers, who teach that manifest heretics immediately lose all jurisdiction. For example, Cyprian holds this in book 4, letter 2, where he speaks in the following way about Novatian, who was Pope in the schism with Cornelius: *He cannot,* he said, *have the episcopate, and if he was already made a bishop, he is to depart from the body of his fellow bishops and from the unity of the Church.* There he says that Novatian, even if he was a true and legitimate Pope, still would lose the pontificate, if he separated himself from the Church.

The opinion of more recent learned men is the same, like John Driedonus, who in book 4 of his book on Scripture and the dogmas of the Church (in chapter 2, part

2, sentence 2) teaches that only those are separated from the Church, who are either expelled, like the excommunicated, or of themselves depart and oppose the Church, like heretics and schismatics. And in the seventh sentence he says that in those who have departed from the Church absolutely no spiritual power remains over those who are in the Church. Melchior Cano in book 4, chapter 2 on theological locations, teaches that heretics are not parts of the Church, nor members, and in the last chapter at argument 12 he says that it cannot even be thought that someone could be the Head and Pope, who is neither a member or a part of the Church. And in the same place he teaches in clear words that occult heretics are still parts and members of the Church, and so an occult heretical Pope is still Pope. Others have the same opinion and we cited them in book 1 on the Church.

The foundation of this opinion is that a manifest heretic in no way is a member of the Church, that is, neither in mind nor in body, neither with internal union nor external. For bad Catholics also are united and are members, in mind through faith, and in body through the confession of faith, and through participation in the visible sacraments. Occult heretics are united and are members, but only with an external union, just as on the other hand, good catechumens belong to the Church with an internal union only, but not external; but manifest heretics belong in no way, as has already been proven.

CHAPTER XXXI

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED FROM THE NAMES, WHICH CUSTOMARILY ARE ATTRIBUTED TO THE ROMAN PONTIFF

The last argument is taken from the names of the Roman bishop, which are fifteen: Pope, Father of Fathers, Pontiff of Christians, Supreme Priest, Chief of Priests, Vicar of Christ, Head of the Body of the Church, Foundation of the building of the Church, Shepherd of the Lord's flock, Father and Teacher of All Christians, Rector of the House of God, Guardian of the Vineyard of God, Spouse of the Church, Head of the Apostolic See, Universal Bishop. His primacy is clearly derived from each and every one of these titles.

Therefore the first most common and ancient name of the Roman bishop is that of Pope. For, St. Ignatius in a letter to Maria Zarbenses said: *When you are in Rome in the presence of Pope Linus, etc.* But among the Greeks the word is "papa" or "papas" and stuttering little children are accustomed to use it when addressing their parents, as is apparent from the comic poet Philemon in book 8 of the Athenaeus where we read: χαίρε πάππα φίλτατε, and Homer in book 6 of the Odyssey where the daughter says to her father, πάππα φίλε; similarly among the ancient Latins it signified father or grandfather, that is, father of one's father.

Therefore ecclesiastics began to apply that familiar term "pope" to their spiritual father.

However, this name is attributed sometimes by the ancients to eveiy bishop; for, Jerome in every letter to Augustine calls him "father," as now every priest is called "father"; nevertheless, in three ways the primacy of the Roman Pontiff is gathered from this name. First, because through antonomasia, when "Pope" is spoken absolutely, he only is understood, as is clear from the Council of Chalcedon in session 16 where we read: *The blessed and apostolic man, the Pope, prescribes this for us.* The name "Leo" is not added, nor Roman, nor of the City of Rome, nor anything else. Secondly, because only he in the whole Church is called Pope, as is clear from the same Council of Chalcedon in session 16, where Leo is called the Pope of the whole Church; and also from Liberatus in chapter 22 of the Breviarium where we read that there is no Pope over the Church of the whole world except the Roman Pontiff. Thirdly, because the Roman Pontiff is called Father or Pope by the whole world and by the general councils; but he calls no one Father or Pope, but all are sons and brothers, as is clear from a letter to the second Council found in Theodoretus in book 5, chapter 10, and from the letter of the Council of Chalcedon to Leo.

The second name is Father of Fathers; it is attributed to Pope Damasus by Stephen, the archbishop of Carthage, in a letter to Damasus which he wrote in the name of three councils of Africa: *To our blessed Lord, raised to the apostolic dignity,* holy Father of Fathers, *Pope Damasus, etc.* We do not read that this name was ever given to anyone else.

The third is: Pontiff of Christians as found in Eusebius in Chronicles of the year 44.

The fourth is: Sovereign Pontiff, which we find in the same letter of Stephen, for, these words follow: *And to the Sovereign Pontiff of all bishops.* Gregoiy also uses this title in book 1, chapter 4 of the Dialogues, St. Anselm in the preface to the book on the

Incarnation of the Word to Pope Urban, and St. Bernard in all his letter to the Roman Pontiffs. Jerome in the preface to the gospels to Damasus said: *You, who are the Sovereign Bishop,* And in the sixth Council in session 18 the whole Council calls Agatho our most Holy Father and Sovereign Pope.

The fifth is: Chief of Priests and we read about this in the letter of Valentinian to Theodotius, which was sent before the Council of Chalcedon and is found in volume I of the Councils: *Most blessed bishop of the city of Rome, on whom antiquity conferred the primacy of the priesthood over all.* And in Prosper in book 2, chapter 6 on the vocation of the Gentiles we read: *Rome, because of the primacy of the priesthood, became more important as the stronghold of religion than as the seat of power.*

But Calvin objects in book 4, chapter 7 § 3 of his Institutes that the Council of Carthage III in canon 26 forbids that anyone should be called prince of priests, or supreme priest, but only the bishop of the first See. I respond that the Council decreed this only for the bishops of Africa, among whom many were equal primates, so that none of them would be called the supreme priest or the chief of the others. For, this provincial council could not obligate the Roman Pontiff or the bishops of other provinces. Therefore, Gregory, Anselm, Bernard, and the sixth Council, notwithstanding this canon, called the Roman Pontiff the Sovereign Pontiff.

The sixth is: Vicar of Christ—St. Bernard uses this title in book 2 on Consideration and also the Council of Lyons II under Gregory X, as found in Sextus in the chapter "Ubi periculum."

The seventh is: Head of the Church, a title the Council of Chalcedon uses in the letter to Leo: *Over whom you preside as the head does over its members;* and in session 1 of the same council the Roman Church is called the head of all the Churches.

But Calvin raises and objection in book 4, chapter 7 § 21 on his Institutes concerning St. Gregory, who in book 4, chapter 28 to John, the bishop of Constantinople, said: *Peter is the first member of the universal Church. Paul, Andrew and James—what are they other than heads of individual peoples? But all are members of the Church under one head.* There Gregory is reprimanding John, who wanted to make himself the head of the whole Church, and he uses this argument that neither Peter nor any other apostle was the head of the whole Church, but they were only heads of individual Churches, and members of the universal Church.

I respond that for someone to be the head of the whole Church can be understood in two ways. In one way, so that he is head in such a way that he alone is head, and chief, and all the other inferiors are not heads, nor chiefs, but only his vicars. In a second way, so that he indeed is the head, but in a general way, so that he does not remove particular inferiors and true heads; as universal causes do not remove particular causes, and as in an army the Emperor does not remove the particular leaders of the legions and cohorts.

Now in the first way only Christ is the head of all the Churches, since compared to Christ, all are vicars and administrators; and no one can be called his colleague or co-bishop. And in this way Peter is not the head, except of the particular Roman Church; for, only of this Church is he the particular and only bishop and head; but of the other Churches the particular heads are their bishops, who are the true leaders, and of Peter

they are not his vicars, but colleagues and co-bishops, and St. Gregory is speaking about this meaning in this place. In the second way Peter was, and now is as the Roman Pontiff truly the head of all the Church, as the same Gregory teaches with these words in book 11, letter 42: *Reverence for the apostolic See is disturbed by the presumption of no one; for then the status of the members remains solid, if no injury affects the head of the faith.* And in letter 54 he said: *The apostolic See is the head of all the Churches.* He says the same thing in his explanation of the fourth penitential Psalm.

The eighth is: The Foundation; St. Jerome in letter 1 to Damasus on the word Hypostasis said: *I know that the Church is built on this rock.* There he calls Damasus the rock of the Church.

The ninth is: Shepherd of the Lord's flock; Ambrose in letter 81 to Pope Siricius said: *We recognize in the letters of your Holiness the watchfulness of a good shepherd, how faithfully your guard the door committed to you, and how you protect the flock of Christ with great care.*

The tenth is: Rector of the House of God; Ambrose in his comments on 1 Tim. 3 said: *The Church is the house of God, whose rector today is Damasus.*

The eleventh is: Guardian of the Vineyard; the Council of Chalcedon in its letter to Leo said: *Moreover against him to whom the care of the vineyard was given by the Savior, that is, against your apostolic holiness, he extends his madness.*

The twelfth is: Father and Teacher of All Christians. We find this in the last session of the Council of Florence; also for this reason the Roman Church is called the mother and teacher of all Churches, as we have it in Lateran Council IV under Innocent III in chapter 5.

The thirteenth is: Spouse of the Church. This is the title given to the Pope in the general Council of Lyons, as it is given in the chapter "Ubi periculum."

But some raise an objection concerning St. Bernard, who in his letter 237 warns Pope Eugene that he should not think of himself as the spouse of the Church, but as the friend of the spouse, and that it seemed to be absurd that the vicar of the king should be called the spouse of the queen.

I respond: Just as the Pope is said to be the head, rector and shepherd of the Church in the place of Christ, so also he is said to be the spouse in the place of Christ, or as the vicar and minster of Christ. For, the true and principal spouse is Christ, as is said in John 3; for, he fecundates the Church with his Spirit, and children are born from the seed of him alone (which is the Word of God). However, pontiffs are called spouses, because they cooperate extrinsically in the generation of children, as ministers of the Word and the Sacraments, and they generate children not for themselves, but for Christ. Therefore Bernard intends only to warn the pontiff not to consider himself the principal spouse. And although it is absurd in carnal generation for the king to be helped by a vicar, and for one spouse to be of many, however in spiritual matters it is not absurd.

The fourteenth is: Head of the Apostolic See. But it should be observed that sometimes by the ancient authors the apostolic Sees are said to be not only the Roman, but also that of Antioch, Jerusalem, Ephesus, and others, which the apostles established, and in which they remained as bishops, as is clear from Tertullian in his book on prescription, and from

Augustine in letter 162, and from others.

But with regard to this name the Roman Pontiff excels in three ways. First, because when the phrase "apostolic See" is said absolutely, and Antiochene, or Ephesian, or Roman, etc. is not added, the Roman is always understood, which be antonomasia is said to be apostolic. This is evident from Augustine's letter 106 where he says: *Concerning this matter relations were sent from the two Councils of Carthage and Mileum to the apostolic See.* He does not add "Roman," still that is what he means, since it is certain from letters 90 and 92 of Augustine that those relations were sent to Pope Innocent; similar examples occur passim.

Secondly, because the Roman Pontiff not only is said to occupy the apostolic See, like Antioch and Ephesus, but also the primacy of the apostolic See, as is clear from Augustine's letter 162.

Thirdly, because the Roman Pontiff not only is said to be the head of the apostolic See, like the Antiochene and certain others, but also his office is said to be the apostleship, as is clear from the Council of Chalcedon in session 1 where we read that the vicars of Leo said: *His apostleship has deigned to order that Dioscorus is not to be seated in the Council.* Likewise the Emperor Honorius in a letter to Boniface said: *First of all we ask that in the daily prayers your apostleship may be pleased to include your fondness and desire concerning our health and supreme authority.* Similarly, in the letter to the bishops of Gaul, which is 51 among the letters of Leo, he said: *May your apostleship grant pardon to our tardiness.* Finally, in letter 190 of Bernard to Innocent we read: J// *dangers and scandals and emergencies in the kingdom of God must be referred to your apostleship.* We read that this name is applied to no one else but to the Roman Pontiff.

From all of this we conclude that the bishops of Antioch and Ephesus, and similar places, were indeed bishops of apostolic Sees, that is, in Sees in which the apostles were in charge; but they did not succeed the apostles in the apostleship in any way; otherwise their dignity would also be called apostleship. But the Roman Pontiff is the bishop of the apostolic See, and succeeds in some way in the apostleship, that is, in the care of the whole world, which was a part of the apostleship, and because of that his grade is called apostleship. Accordingly an objection of Nilus is answered, since in his book on the primacy of the Pope he tries to prove that the Roman Pontiff does not have primacy over the other bishops from the fact that the bishops of Antioch, Ephesus and Jerusalem are said to have apostolic thrones.

The fifteenth is: Universal Bishop. In session 3 of the Council of Chalcedon there is a reading of three letters of the Greeks to Pope Leo, and all of them begin in this way: *To the holy and blessed universal archbishop and patriarch of great Rome, Leo, etc.* Because of these words three lies of the heretics are refuted. One is of Luther in his book on the power of the Pope where, when he said that Gregory had refused the title of "universal," he added: *What, did he say anything about the name of supreme and holy?* Therefore, Luther is saying that at the time of Gregory the name of holy and supreme had not yet been heard; by saying this the incredible ignorance or malice of Luther is revealed. For, all the old authors call the Roman Pope holy, and the place just cited surely closes Luther's mouth.

What about this—that in session 2 of the same Council of Chalcedon Aetius, bishop of Nicopolis, calls St. Leo our Lord and most holy Pope? No other title is more displeasing to the heretics of our time than this one. However, since it did not displease formerly the whole council, and senate, and judges, Aetius said to those listening to him: *Since the letter of our Lord and holy Pope has been read, etc.* Gregory himself uses the word "supreme," as we noted above in book 1, chapter 4 of the Dialogues, and the whole Council of Chalcedon in the letter to Leo speaks about "your supreme honor" concerning Leo the Pontiff.

The second lie is that of the Magdeburgenses, who in Centuries 6, chapter 7, col. 439 say that the Roman Pontiff was made a patriarch by the Emperor Justinian in the year 520. But if that is true, then how is it that in the Council of Chalcedon, which was held in the year 454, Leo is frequently called the universal patriarch?

The third lie is that of Calvin, who in book 4, chapter 7 § 4 of his Institutes cites the words of St. Gregory, who in book 4, letter 32 and elsewhere says that in the Council of Chalcedon the title of "universal" was given to his predecessors, and then he adds immediately: *This has no sign of being true, for such a thing is not read in the acts of this Council.* Now this lie is shameless; for although this Council decreed nothing about this matter, nevertheless it is certain enough that it was not displeasing to this Council that this title should be given to the Roman Pontiff, since in session 3 the Pontiff Leo often is called by this name, and no one in the Council objected to this appellation.

But the same Calvin raises an objection from the words of Gregoiy against this name, who in book 4, letter 32 and in many other places often repeats that the name of universal bishop is profane, sacrilegious, a sign of the Antichrist; and therefore that none of his predecessors ever wanted to use it. Also Illyricus objects in his book on the history of sixth Council of Carthage, and Luther in his book on the power of the Pope concerning the canon of the African Council cited by Gratian as dist. 99, the canon of the First See, where we read: *The Roman Pontiff is not said to be universal.*

I respond that the title of "universal bishop" can be understood in two ways. In one way, as he who is said to be "universal" is understood to be the only bishop of all the Christian cities, so that the others are not bishops, but only the vicars of him who is said to be the universal bishop. In this way this name is really profane, sacrilegious and anti-Christian; and it is about this meaning that Gregory is speaking, as is clear from the reason he gives. For thus he says in book 4, letter 36 to Eulogius: *If one patriarch is said to be universal, the name of the patriarchs is taken away from the others.* And in book 7, letter 69 to Eusebius: *If one is universal, the result is that you are not bishops.* In the second way, a bishop can be said to be universal who has the care of the whole Church, but in a general way, so that it does not exclude particular bishops. And in this way it is proved that this name can be given to the Roman Pontiff according to the mind of Gregory.

First: Because Gregory says in book 4, letter 32, and in other places, that the name of universal bishop was given to the Roman Pontiff by the Council of Chalcedon, which Gregoiy teaches passim was a holy and Catholic council. Therefore St. Gregory thought that in some sense this name is fitting for the Roman Pontiff. Secondly: Because the same

Gregory in book 4, letter 32 says that the care of the whole Church was committed to Peter by the Lord, which is the same as if he were to say that Peter is the universal bishop constituted by Christ.

Thirdly: Because even if the Roman Pontiffs, as Gregory rightly says, never called themselves universal bishops, still often they called themselves the bishops of the universal Church, as is clear from letter 2 of Sixtus I, from letter 1 of Victor I, from letter 2 of Pontianus, from letter 2 of Stephen I, from letters 54, 62 and 65 of Leo I. Doubtless Gregory had read these testimonies, and he knew that the meaning was the same of the expressions—bishop of the universal Church and universal bishop.

But you will object: If this name can have a good meaning, why does Gregoiy say absolutely that it is proud, sacrilegious, profane, and absolutely forbid its use?

I respond: For two reasons: first, as a caution; as also the name, Christotokos, has a good meaning, and still the Fathers forbade the use of that name, lest perhaps under that name the heresy of Nestorius would hide, who said that Mary was the mother of Christ but not the mother of God. Secondly, because the question then was: whether or not this name could be conceded to bishop John of Constantinople, but not whether it could be conceded to the Roman Pontiff. Therefore, since the name of universal bishop in no way was suitable for John, and nevertheless he usurped it for himself, therefore Gregory decreed simply and absolutely that this name is profane and sacrilegious, that is, inasmuch as it is attributed to the bishop of Constantinople. And so even he refused to use it, although in some sense it was suitable for him, in order better and more easily to keep in check the pride of the Constantinople bishop.

To the other objection of Luther and Illyricus I say that they did not understand that those words are not from the African synod, but from Gratian, who after he had stated the canon of the African Synod, whereby it is forbidden for bishops of the first See to be called the leader of priests, added on his own: *But the Roman Pontiff is not said to be universal.* Since these words come from Gratian they do not have authority; moreover, they can be understood in the way in which the words of St. Gregory are understood.

However, it is worth mentioning in this place how great the obstinacy and pride of the Greeks was, and still is, and how severely it was punished by God. For, since they wanted to elevate the See of the bishop of Constantinople, which for more than 300 years had no place among the primary Sees, not only to a patriarchate and to place it before Alexandria and Antioch, but also to make it equal to Rome and universal, and since they could not be reduced to sanity by the censures of Pelagius II and of other Pontiffs (for this reason they were often excommunicated, as Leo IX writes in his letter to Michael), nor also by the humility of St. Gregory, who, as Deacon John writes in book 2, chapter 1 of his life, for this reason began to write that he was not an archbishop or patriarch, but only the bishop and servant of the servants of God, nor even by the edict of the Emperor Phocus, about whom we spoke above; finally, by the judgment of God from heaven, the Greeks with their universal patriarch were delivered into the hands of the Turks. St. Bridget in book 7, chapter 9 of her Revelations had predicted that this would happen to them, and also Pope Nicholas V, as Gennadius Scholarius recounts in his book on the Council of Florence in chapter 7 § 12.

BOOK THREE

On the Antichrist: he has nothing in common with the Roman Pontiff

CHAPTER I

THE ARGUMENT ABOUT THE ANTICHRIST IS PROPOSED

We have demonstrated so far that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the supreme primacy of the whole Church. It remains for us to see whether at one time the Roman Pontiff lost that primacy, for that is what the adversaries contend, namely, that at this time in Rome there is no true bishop, whatever the situation was before. And in fact Nilus at the end of his little book against the primacy of the Roman Pontiff says this: *But tht main point and head of my position is this: as long as the Pope preserves the order in tht Church that is proper and heavenly as instituted in the beginning; as long as he hold and protects the heavenly truth; and as long as he adheres to Christ, the supreme and true lord and head of the Church, I will willingly accept him both as head of the Church and supreme priest, and that he is the successor of Peter, or also if he so wishes, of all the apostles, and that all should obey him and take away nothing that pertains to his honor. But if he has abandoned the truth, and does not want to return to it, deservedly he must be considered as damned and rejected.* These are his words.

But he should have shown into what enors the Roman Pontiffs have fallen, and when, and by whom they were condemned. For we know that in the general Council of the Lateran under Innocent III, and in Lyons under Gregoiy X, and in Florence under Eugene IV the Greeks admitted their errors and returned to the faith of the Latins, and then they always returned to their vomit, and because of that they were gravely punished by God. But nowhere do we read that the Latins went over to the faith of the Greeks. And no ecclesiastical judgment against the Latins can be cited, as we can produce many of them against the Greeks.

Indeed Calvin said in book 4, chapter 7 § 23 of his Institutes: *Let all those things be true, but we have already wrested them away from them—that Peter by the word of Christ was constituted the head of the universal Church, that he deposited the honor given to him in the Roman See, that it was sanctioned by the authority of the ancient Church, that it was confirmed by long use, that the supreme power was always given to the Roman Pontiff by all, and that he always was the judge of all cases and persons; let them have even more if they so wish. But I respond with one word—nothing of that has any value, unless there is a Church and a bishop in Rome.* And after that in § 24: *The Romans make this easy for me: I deny that their pontiff is the first of all the bishops, because he is not a bishop.* And further on: *Surely at one time Rome was the mother of all the Churches; but since it began to be the chair of the Antichrist, it ceased to be what it was.* And after

that in § 25: *To some we seem to be abusive and petulant, since we call the Roman Pontiff the Antichrist; but those who think this way do not understand that Paul accused him of intemperate conduct, and we are following his lead and indeed we are using the words of his mouth. And lest someone object that we are falsely twisting the words of Paul, which pertain to another, in order to apply them to the Roman Pontiff, briefly I will show that they can be understood in no other way than as referring to the papacy.* These are his words.

All the heretics of the present time say similar things; and especially Luther in the reckoning of the times, and in his assertions 28 and 36, and elsewhere passim. Likewise the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 2, col. 434ff. and in all the following Centuries; Illyricus in the book on the primacy of David, Chytraeus on chapters 9 and 13 of the Apocalypse. Likewise Wolfgang Musculus in the work on the Church, Theodore Beza in the Commentary on 2 Thess. 2, Theodore Bibliander in Chronicles 10 to 14, Henry Pantaleon in the Chronology, Henry Bullingerus in the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse, and before all of these John Wycliffe in article 30 among those condemned by the Council of Constance in session 8, because he said the pontiff was the Antichrist.

Therefore in order that this question may be explained carefully, there are nine points that must be considered. First, on the name itself of the Antichrist. 2) Whether the Antichrist is one man, or a group of men. 3) On the time of his coming and his death. 4) On his proper name. 5) From what people will he be born, and by whom especially accepted. 6) Where he will establish his throne. 7) On his doctrine and morals. 8) On his miracles. 9) On his kingdom and his battles. For, from all of these it will become crystal clear with what impudence the heretics make the Roman Pontiff into the Antichrist. To these we will add a chapter in which we will prove that the Roman Pontiff not only is not the Antichrist, but in no way has ceased to be the bishop and shepherd of the whole Church, so that nothing remains that is not answered from the objections of Calvin.

Concerning the first point, some of the adversaries teach that the name "Antichrist" properly signifies the vicar of Christ; and therefore that the Pope, who calls himself the vicar of Christ, is the Antichrist himself. Wolfgang Musculus teaches this in the chapter on the power of ministers, and he proves it by saying that the word ἀντί signifies "in the place of"; hence Αντίχριστος means in the place of Christ; as Αντιστράτηγος signifies the one who forces himself on the leader, that is, who wants to be considered the vicar of the leader. The Magdeburgenses also in the Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435, say that the Pope is the Antichrist, because he makes himself the vicar of Christ.

But without doubt they are in error, or they are trying to deceive. For, the name of Antichrist cannot in any way signify the vicar of Christ, but only someone opposed to Christ, and not opposed in just any way, but so that he struggles with him over the throne and dignity of Christ, that is, he is an emulator of Christ, and he wants to be known as Christ, after having displaced the one who truly is Christ.

There are three proofs that this is the meaning of this name. First, because among the Greeks that word ἀντί properly signifies opposition, and since not only things that fight among themselves are said to be opposed, but also those things that are equal, hence

it has happened, that ἀντί in composition sometimes signifies opposition, sometime equivalence, but never subordination, which is evident in all such names: ἀντίπαλος means an adversary in a fight; ἀντίδοτον is a contrary medicine; ἀντίφρασις is contrary speech; ἀντίστροφος is equivalent, ἀντίθεος is equal to God; ἀντίχειρ is the thumb because it is opposed to the fingers, and it is opposed to the rest of the hand, and so with the others. However, the word "vicar" does not signify opposition, but subordination to another; and therefore it cannot be expressed by the word ἀντί.

Then the word ἀντίστρατηγος does not signify the vicar of the leader, but ordinarily a contrary leader; as ἀντίστρατεύομαι means to make war against, and sometimes it means the one who is in the place of the leader, not as subject to him, but as his equal. It is as among the Latins the words pro-praetor or pro-consul do not signify the vicar of a praetor or of a consul, but the one who in some province is what a praetor is, or a consul in a city; and in this matter Musculus was mistaken. For since he reads in Budaeus that ἀναστρατηγος signifies pro-praetor, he thought that it meant the vicar of the praetor, which is false.

Secondly, the same point is proved from Scripture. For, although this word is of itself ambiguous, still as it is used in Scripture it is not ambiguous, and our question should not be about the word Αντίχριστος absolutely, but as it is used in Scripture. In addition, in Scripture the Antichrist is said to be the one *who exalts himself against all that is called God* (2 Thess. 2:4), which is certainly not to be the vicar but the enemy of Christ, the true God. And in 1 John 2:22 the Antichrist is said to be the one *who denies that Jesus is the Christ,* that is, who denies that Jesus is the Christ, so that he can promote himself as the Christ. And in Matt. 24:24 the Antichrist is said to be about to claim that he is the Christ, which of course is not his vicar, but his emulator.

Thirdly, it is proved from all the authors who have written about the Antichrist, and from the common sense of all Christians, who understand by the Antichrist a certain outstanding Pseudo-Christ. Damascene also explains the word in this way from the ancient Greeks in book 4, chapter 28 in his book on Faith, and Jerome explains it in the same way from the Latins and he was also an expert in the Greek language.

Finally, Henry Stephanus gives a similar explanation in his Thesaurus of the Greek language; however, he is one of the Geneva heretics. Hence we have the first argument against the adversaries. For, since the name of Antichrist signifies an enemy and emulator of Christ, and the Roman Pontiff says that he is the servant of Christ and subject to Christ in all things, but he does not claim in any way that he is the Christ, nor does he make himself equal to Christ, it is obvious that he is not the Antichrist.

CHAPTER II

THE ANTICHRIST IS A CERTAIN FUTURE MAN

NOW concerning the second point, we agree with the adversaries on one thing, and disagree on another. We agree in the fact that as the name of Christ is taken in two senses, sometimes properly for the excellent and singular Christ, who is Jesus of Nazareth; and sometimes generally for all those who have a similarity with Christ with regard to anointing, as all the prophets, and kings, and priests are said to be Christs, as in Ps. 105:15, *Touch not my anointed ones.* So also the name of Antichrist sometimes is taken properly for some outstanding enemy of Christ, who is mentioned in 2 Thess. 2:8, in 2 John 7 and elsewhere; and sometimes it is taken generally for all those who oppose Christ in any way. For, in 1 John 2:18 we read: *You have heard that the Antichrist is coming, so now many Antichrists have come,* that is, you have heard that the Antichrist is going to come, and now although that singular Antichrist has not yet come, still many deceivers have already come, who also can be called Antichrists.

But we disagree about the Antichrist in the proper sense, whether he is one singular person. For, all Catholics think that the Antichrist will be one individual man; but all the heretics cited above teach that the Antichrist in the proper sense is not an individual person, but an individual tyrannical throne or kingdom, and an apostate chair of those who preside over the Church.

The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435 said: *The apostles teach that the Antichrist will not be just one person, but a whole kingdom, presiding through false teachers in the temple of God, that is, in the Church; it will be in a large city, that is, in the city of Rome, endowed with the works of the devil and with fraud and deceit.* These are his words. Similar statements are made by those cited above.

Their reasons are the following. First, Paul in 2 Thess. 2:7 says that already in his time that the Antichrist had begun to act: *For the mystery of lawlessness,* he said, *is already at work;* however, in the same place he says that at the end of the world the Antichrist will be killed by Christ. Hence Beza concludes in this way in comments on 2 Thess. 2: *Manifestly they are hallucinating whoever think that this must be understood about any one man, unless they give me someone who continues to live from the time of Paul until the Day of Judgment.* Calvin argues similarly in the place cited. This reasoning is confirmed from John who in letter 1, chapter 4:3 says: *Every spirit which does not confess Jesus is not of God. This is the spirit of Antichrist, of which you heard that he is coming, and now is in the world already.*

The second reason is that of Beza. Since Daniel in chapter 7 under the individual names of beasts, a bear, a lion and a leopard, does not understand individual kings, but individual kingdoms, each one of which contains many kings; therefore Paul in 2 Thess. 2, who wonderfully agrees with Daniel, by the man of sin and the son of perdition does not understand one individual person, but rather a certain body of many tyrants.

The third reason is that of Calvin, in his comments on 1 John 2, where he says that those who think that the Antichrist is one definite future man are crazy and willingly in

error, since Paul in 2 Thess. 2 wrote about the coming apostasy and its head, the future Antichrist; but apostasy is a general defection from the faith, which makes one body and one kingdom, and it is not something of a few years, so that it can be completed under one king.

Notwithstanding these objections, the truth is that the Antichrist will be one individual man; this is proved from all the Scriptures and Fathers, who deal with the Antichrist. On this there are five places in Scripture. The first is in John 5:43: *I have come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me; if another comes in his own name, him you will receive.* Musculus and Calvin, in Marloratus in the Commentary on this text, say that these words are to be understood to be about false prophets in general, not about one individual; but their explanation is in conflict with the ancient Fathers and with the text itself. For, Chrysostom and Cyril on this text say that these words were said about the one Antichrist; the same is said by Ambrose on 2 Thess. 2, Jerome in his letter to Algasias, question 2, by Augustine in tractate 29 on John, by Irenaeus in book 5 against the heretic Valentine, by Theodoretus in the chapter on the Antichrist, and by others.

Moreover, here the Lord opposes another man to himself, a person to a person, not a kingdom to a kingdom, not a sect to a sect, as is clear from these words: *I,* the other; *in my name,* in his name; *me,* him; therefore just as Christ was one individual man, so also the Antichrist will be one individual man.

Then, Christ says here that the Antichrist will be received by the Jews as the Messiah, but it is certain that the Jews are expecting a certain individual man. Likewise, all the false prophets came in the name of someone else, not in their own name, according to Jer. 14:14: *The prophets are prophesying lies in my name; I did not sent them, etc.* But here the Lord is speaking about one man, who will come in his own name, that is, who does not acknowledge any God, but *exalts himself,* as Paul says, *above all that is called God.*

Finally, many false prophets came before the coming of Christ; many also will come afterwards; therefore the Lord would not have said, *if another comes,* but he would have said "many are coming," if he wanted to speak about false prophets.

The second place is Paul in 2 Thess. 2:3: *That day will not come, unless the rebellion comes first, and the man of sin is revealed, the son of perdition, etc.* And after that: *And then the lawless one will be revealed, and the Lord will slay him with the breath of his mouth.* The adversaries understand these words also to be about the true Antichrist, but the Apostle is talking about a certain, particular person, as is evident from the Greek articles: αποκαλυφθη ὁ ανθρωπος της αμαρτίας ὁ υιος της απωλείας. And after that: και τότε αποκαλυφθήσεται ὁ ανομος; for, as Epiphanius teaches in Heresies 9, which is about Samaritans, the Greek articles restrict the meaning to one certain thing, so that ανθρωπος signifies man in general, but ὁ ανθρωπος means one individual man.

The third place is 1 John 2:18, where we read this: ηκούσατε ότι ὁ αντίχριστος έρχεται, και νυν αντίχριστοι πολλοί γεγόνασιν, where the article precedes the word "Antichrist"; but without the article it expresses the name of Antichrist taken in a general sense, openly indicating that Antichrist is one certain person; but Antichrist commonly accepted is not a certain person, but in general all heretics.

The fourth place is Daniel in chapters 7, 11 and 12, where he speaks about the

Antichrist, as Jerome and Theodoretus say in reference to this place; also Irenaeus in book 5, and Augustine in book 20, chapter 23 of *The City of God,* and Calvin, the Magdeburgenses and Beza, as mentioned above. But there the Antichrist is not called one kingdom, but one certain king who, of the ten kings who come into the world, totally removes three of them, and he subjects the other seven to himself. Add to this what Calvin says—that Daniel is speaking literally about the illustrious Antiochus, and allegorically about the Antichrist, concerning whom Antiochus was a type or figure. This same thing is taught by Cyprian in chapter 2 of his book on martyrdom, and by Jerome on chapters 2 and 12 in Daniel. But the illustrious Antiochus was a definite, individual person; therefore also the Antichrist must be a definite person.

The fifth and last place is Rev. 13 and 17. Irenaeus in book 5 says that these places are to be understood about the Antichrist, and this is evident from the similarity of the words of Daniel and John. For, both mention the ten kings, who will be on earth when the Antichrist comes, and both predict that the kingdom of the Antichrist will last for three and a half years, etc. Therefore, just as Daniel speaks about one certain king, so does John in the book of Revelation.

The same thing is proved from the Fathers, who teach about the Antichrist with common agreement. First, they say that he will be the chosen instrument of the devil, so that all the fullness of diabolical malice will dwell in him corporally, as all the fullness of the divinity dwells in the man Christ corporally. Secondly, they say that the Antichrist will reign only for three and a half years; and therefore they teach that the Antichrist will be one man only. See Irenaeus in book 5 near the end, Cyril of Jerusalem in the Catechism 15, Chrysostom on 2 Thess. 2, Theodoretus on Dan. 7; Lactantius in chapter 11 of the Epitome of the divine Institutes, Ambrose on Luke 21; Jerome on Dan. 7 and question 2 to Algasias; Augustine through many chapters in book 20 of *The City of God,* and on Ps. 9, Gregory in book 32, chapter 12 of his Morality, Damascene in book 4, chapter 28, and the martyr Hippolytus in the Oration on the end of the world.

I respond to the first argument of Beza that during the time of the apostles the Antichrist began to advance secretly, not in his own person, but in his precursors. For, just as Christ began to come from the beginning of the world in the patriarchs and prophets, who preceded and signified him figuratively, so that it could be said that from the beginning of the world the mystery of salvation began to operate, and still in his own person he did not come, until he assumed flesh from blessed Mary; so also the Antichrist, soon after Christ's ascension into heaven, began to come in his precursors, and the mystery of iniquity began to operate, and in fact it took place in the heretics and tyrants persecuting the Church, especially in Simon Magus, who said that he was Christ, and in Nero, who first began to attack the Church, and nevertheless he will not come in his own person until the end of the world. Therefore the spiritual persecution of Simon Magus, and the temporal of Nero, is called the mystery of iniquity, because they were signs and figures of the persecution of Antichrist.

It can be proved in two ways that this is the true explanation of the Pauline text. First, from all the interpreters of that place; for, all by the mystery of iniquity in Paul understand either the persecution of Nero, as Ambrose and Chrysostom say in this place,

and Jerome in question 2 to Algasias, or the heretics, who also deceive, as Theodoretus and Sedulius say on this place, and also Augustine in book 20, chapter 19 in *The City of God.* Secondly, by the reason taken from the confession of the adversaries, for they say that the Antichrist in the proper sense is the chair of the Roman Pontiff.

Therefore if the Antichrist, properly speaking, was born at the time of the apostles, it follows that Peter and Paul were properly speaking Antichrists, although occult; and that Nero or Simon Magus were the true Christ. For it is certain that at the time of the apostles there were no other bishops in Rome but Peter and Paul; for, Irenaeus clearly says in book 3, chapter 3 that the Roman See was founded by Peter and Paul, and that they were the first bishops to preside there. All the old authors, whom we have cited above, teach the same thing. It is certain also that both Simon Magus and Nero fought with Peter and Paul.

But if it is not pleasing to the adversaries that Peter and Paul were Antichrists, and that Simon and Nero were the true Christ, then they are forced to admit that at the time of the apostles the Antichrist did not exist in himself, but only in a certain type of himself. Because of this, the consequence of Beza, whereby he claims that the Antichrist cannot be one man, unless we find one man who lived from the times of the apostles to the end of the world is shown to be ridiculous.

In confirmation of this I say that John is speaking in the same way as the Lord speaks about Elijah in Matt. 17:11: *Elijah does come, and he is to restore all things; but I tell you that Elijah has already come, and they did not know him,* that is, Elijah in his own person is to come, but Elijah has already come in his likeness, that is, in John the Baptist.

To the second argument, it is denied first of all that Daniel always understands by the individual beasts individual kingdoms. For, by one beast sometimes he does signify one kingdom, as in chapter 7 where by the lion he understands the kingdom of the Assyrians, by the bear the kingdom of the Persians, by the leopard the kingdom of the Greeks, and by another unnamed the kingdom of the Romans; sometimes it is one kingdom, as in chapter 8, where by the ram he understands Darius, the last king of the Persians, and by the he-goat Alexander the Great. Then, the consequence of the argument is denied. For, Paul by the expression "man of sin" does not understand it as one of the four beasts described by Daniel, but as that small horn, which in Daniel prevails over the ten horns of the fourth beast, that is, that one king who, beginning small, so increased that he subjected all the other kings to himself.

To the last argument I respond in many ways so that it may be understood how impudently Calvin wrote that those err willingly who do not conclude from his argument that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist. First, by the word "apostasy" in Paul the Antichrist himself can be rightly understood, because the Greek interpreters with common agreement teach this, like Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylactus and Oecumenius, and also St. Augustine in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God.* However, the Antichrist is called Apostasy, both my metonymy, for he will be the cause for many of abandoning God, and also by a certain excellence, because he will be an extraordinary apostate, so that he can be called apostasy itself.

Secondly, by apostasy the disappearance of the Roman Empire can be understood, as many Latins explain it, such as Ambrose, Sedulius and Primasius. For, as we will

prove in a subsequent chapter, the Antichrist will not come before the Roman Empire completely disappears.

Thirdly, if we admit that by apostasy is understood defection from the true faith of Christ and religion (as Calvin shows), we are not put in a corner because of that. For, it is not necessary that Paul is speaking about the apostasy of many centuries; for he could be speaking about a certain intense and singular apostasy, which will last only for a short time, during which the Antichrist will reign. That many of the ancients understood it in this way was explained by Augustine in the place cited, that is, in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God.* They taught as probable that, when the Antichrist appeared, all occult heretics, or feigned Christians will go to him, and from him will come such a great apostasy such as never existed before.

Fourthly, if we grant to Calvin that St. Paul is speaking about the apostasy of many centuries, he still gains no advantage from that; since we can say that that apostasy does not necessarily pertain to one body and kingdom of the Antichrist, nor does it demand one head, but it is a disposition for the kingdom of Antichrist, and that it will take place in different places, under different kings, on different occasions, as we now see that Africa has fallen to the Mohammedans, a large part of Asia to Nestorius and Eutyches, and other provinces to various sects.

Fifthly and finally, if we should grant to Calvin that there is a general apostasy from the faith, and that the kingdom of Antichrist lasts for many years, from that it would not follow immediately that the Pope is the Antichrist. For, there still remains a question to be answered concerning who fell away from the faith and religion of Christ: was it we or they? For, although they say it is we who have fallen away, still they have not proved that, nor has it been declared by any common judge.

And surely we can prove much more easily that it is the Lutherans who have defected, than they can prove that Catholics have defected. Actually, they do not deny that they have defected from the Church to which they formerly belonged. For, without mentioning other points, Erasmus Sarcerius in his comments on 2 Thess. 2:8, *then the lawless one will be revealed,* frankly admits that almost all the predecessors of the Lutherans, and himself at one time were subject to the Roman Pontiff. Therefore they defected from the Church and religion of their predecessors; but that we have defected from the Church, so far they have not demonstrated, nor will they ever be able to demonstrate. Therefore, since they read in St. Paul: *That day will not come, unless the rebellion or apostasy come first, and the man of sin is revealed, etc.,* and think that they have defected from the Church, in which they were, but that we have remained always in the same institution: it is truly astonishing if they do not at least fear lest Paul was speaking about them.

In this second chapter we have the second argument to prove that the Pontiff is not the Antichrist. For, if the Antichrist is only one person, but the pontiffs were and will be many, endowed with the same dignity and authority, certainly the Antichrist must be sought somewhere else rather than in the Roman See.

CHAPTER III

IT IS SHOWN THAT THE ANTICHRIST HAS NOT YET COME

Regarding the third question, about the time of the coming of the Antichrist, many false suspicions and many errors exist, both among Catholics and among heretics. But there is this difference that the Catholics, knowing that the Antichrist will not come until the end of the world, which is the truth, they erred because they have thought that the end of the world was closer than it really was. But the heretics err because they think the Antichrist will come a long time before the end of the world, and really has come already. Therefore we will consider both of these errors.

First of all, all the ancients, commenting on the evils of their time, have suspected that the time of the Antichrist was imminent. Thus the Thessalonians, during the time of the apostles, thought that the day of the Lord was at hand, and the Apostle corrected them in 2 Thess. 2: Iff. Likewise Cyprian in book 3, letter 1 said: *The coming of Antichrist is imminent and he is preparing his soldiers for battle, etc.* And in book 4, letter 6: *You should know,* he said, *and believe and hold for certain that the day of affliction has begun for us, and that the end of the age and the time of Antichrist has approached.* Jerome in a letter to Ageruchia on monogamy said: *Do we not understand that the Antichrist is drawing near?* Gregoiy in book 4, letter 38 said: *Everything that was predicted is taking place—the king of pride is near.* And in a homily on the Gospel he boldly proclaims that the end of the world is at hand; but those were suspicions, not errors, because those holy Fathers did not dare to designate a certain time.

But then others more boldly predicted a certain time. A certain Judas, as Jerome states in his book on illustrious men, in the year of Christ 200 thought that the Antichrist will come and the world end; he of course was wrong. Again, Lactantius in book 7, chapter 25 of the divine Institution said: *All expectation seems to be not more than 200 years, etc.* There he teaches that the Antichrist will come and the world will end within 200 years after his time. He lived at the time of Constantine around the year 300, therefore he thought that by the year 500 after Christ the world would end, but he also was deceived, as is proved by experience.

St. Augustine in book 18, chapter 53 of *The City of God* mentions the error of others who said that the world would end 400 years after the Ascension of the Lord, and also the view of some others who said it would happen in the year 1000, and they were all wrong. This also was the view of some pagans who, according to Augustine in the same place, concluded from I know not what divine source that the Christian religion would last only 365 years. There was also a certain Florentine bishop around the year of the Lord 1105, who said that the Antichrist was bom then, and therefore that the end of the world was near. For this reason a council of 340 bishops was convoked at Florence by Pope Paschal II. See the Chronicle of Matthew Palmerius, and Platinas in his life of Paschal II.

Finally, there has always been the famous opinion of many who say that the world will last for six thousand years, since God created the world in six days, and a thousand years for God are like one day. Thus Justin in question 71 for the Gentiles, Irenaeus in

book 5, Lactantius in book 7, chapter 14, Hilary on Matt. 17, Jerome on Psalm 90, and Cyprian. The opinion of the Talmudists also agrees with this view; they say that they have a prophecy from the prophet Elijah in which it is stated that the world will last for six thousand years.

This opinion cannot yet be refuted by experience; for, according to the true chronology more or less five thousand six hundred years have elapsed since the creation of the world. Hence Ambrose, who in book 7 on Luke 2 rejects this opinion and says in his time the six thousand years had already elapsed, clearly is mistaken. The moderation of St. Augustine on his matter is excellent; he thought that this opinion is probable, and he followed it as probable in book 20, chapter 7 of *The City of God.* But it does not follow from this that we know the last day. For, we say it is probable that the world will not last more than six thousand years; but we do not say it is certain. Therefore the same Augustine sharply rebukes those who say that the world will end at a certain time, since the Lord said in Acts 1:7: *It is not for you to know times or seasons which the Father has fixed by his own authority.* See Augustine in letter 80 to Hesychius on Ps. 90 and book 18, chapter 53 of *The City of God.* That is enough; let us now come to the heretics.

Since all contemporary heretics teach that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, and so has already appeared, and is active in the world, still among themselves they do not agree about the time when he appeared; on this matter they have six opinions.

The first is that of the Samosatians who live in Hungary and Transylvania. In a certain small book which carries the title: *Premonitions of Christ and the Apostles about the abolition of the true Christ by the Antichrist,* they teach that the Antichrist appeared right after the time of the apostles, that is, when the Church began to preach that Christ is the eternal Son of God. For, they think that Christ is a mere man, and that there is only one person in God, and this was the faith taught by Christ and the apostles. But shortly after the death of the apostles the Roman Antichrist came, and having abolished the true Christ who was a mere man, they introduced another eternal Christ, and they made God into three persons, and gave two natures to Christ.

This opinion, in addition to the arguments we will present below against all the heretics, is easily refuted in two ways. First, because when the Antichrist comes *he will make himself God,* not someone else, as the Apostle says in 2 Thess. 2. But the Roman Pontiff, as they themselves admit, did not make himself God, but he preached Christ, and made him God from a pure man. Secondly, because they say soon after the death of Christ and the apostles the true faith of Christ was totally wiped out by the Antichrist; and in the whole world after that Christ was adored as God. But Christ predicted that the gates of hell would never prevail against his Church (Matt. 16). And an angel predicted in Luke 1:33 that the kingdom of Christ would last forever. And David predicted in Ps. 72:11 that all kings would serve the Christ. Therefore how is it true that in the very beginning the nascent Church was destroyed by the Antichrist?

The second opinion is that of Illyricus, who in the catalogue of witnesses teaches that the Antichrist came, when the Roman Empire began to fall into ruins; but it is certain that the Roman Empire began to collapse after the tenth year of Honorius, when Rome was captured for the first time, that is, in the year of the Lord 412, as Blondus shows in book

1 of the histoiy of the decline of the Roman Empire. But Illyricus seems to understand this to be about the conception, not the birth of Christ; since the same man in Centuries 6, chapter 1, teaches that the Antichrist was conceived in a certain way at the beginning of the year 400, then animated, and formed, and nourished in the womb of his mother around the year 500; and finally in the year 606 he was bom, that is, when conceded to the Roman Pontiff that he should be called the head of the whole Church. In Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 438, Illyricus teaches that the Antichrist will rule and rage with a spiritual sword for 1260 years, but with a temporal sword for 666 years, and then the end of the world will take place.

He gathers the first number from Rev. 11:3, where it is said that the time of the Antichrist will last for 1260 days. For, Illyricus says that a day is to be taken for a year. He gets the last number from Rev. 13:18, where the number of the beast is said to be 666.

This opinion can be refuted in two ways. For, it follows first of all that the Antichrist not only has already been bom, but that he has also died, and so the end of the world has already come. For, the Roman Pontiff began with his temporal sword, that is, to have temporal power at least from the year 699, for then Aripertus gave the Roman Pontiff the Coetian Alps, where Genoa now is; and afterwards in the year 714 Luitprandus confirmed that gift, as Ado of Vienne writes in the Chronicle of these years, Blondus in book 10; the Magdeburgenses say the same thing in Centuries 8, chapter 10, col. 685, and also Theodore Bibliander who in this year of 714 mentions that it became the first papal province.

Not long afterwards, that is, in the year 755, Pepin gave to the Roman Pontiffs the exarchate of Ravenna with a large part of Italy, as is testified to by Rhegino, Ado Sigebertus, Blondus in book 2, P. Aemilius and also the Centuriatorians in Centuries 8, chapter 10, col 724, and Theodore Bibliander in the Chronicles. Therefore, if the kingdom of Antichrist began in the year 755, and lasted for 666 years, then it reached its end in the year of Christ 1421; therefore, there are now more than 150 years since the Antichrist died. But if the beginning of his kingdom in placed earlier, that is, in the year of our Lord 699, then his end must be place in the year 1365 and there will then be more than 200 years that have elapsed after the death of the Antichrist.

Perhaps they will respond that after the year 666 of his temporal kingdom, the Antichrist was not going to die, but only to lose his temporal power. For, since they say that the spiritual kingdom of the Antichrist will last for 1360 years, which have not yet come to an end, and if they began in the year of Christ 606, consequently they must say that the spiritual kingdom of the Antichrist will last for some time after the destruction of his temporal kingdom. But certainly this is absurd and contrary to all the authors; moreover, at least it follows that the pontiffs already 200 years ago should have lost their temporal power, which is contrary to experience.

Secondly, the same error can be refuted, because it follows from this error that the Centuriatorians knew exactly when the world would end, and this is contrary to the words of the Lord in Acts 1 and Matt. 24. What follows is clear: for they know that the Antichrist began to rule with the spiritual sword in the year 606; they also know that he is going to rule only for 1260 years, and then immediately the Lord is going to come to

judge, as they conclude from 2 Thess. 3. Therefore they know that the last judgment is going to take place in the year of Christ 1866, or if they do not know this, they are also forced not to know whether the Antichrist will come at all.

The third opinion is that of David Chytraeus, who in his commentary on Rev. 9 teaches with Illyricus that the Antichrist appeared around the year 600 of the Lord and he says clearly that St. Gregory was the first antichristian pontiff. But the same Chytraeus in his commentary on chapter 11 and 13 does not agree with Illyricus regarding the time of the duration of the Antichrist, but he prudently warns that it should not be rashly defined. But he proves with three reasons that the Antichrist appeared in the year 600.

First, because at that time Gregory established the invocation of the saints and Masses for the dead. Secondly, because in the year 606 the Roman Pope, Boniface III obtained from Phocas the title of universal bishop. He adds a third reason in his commentary on chapter 13, because this time plainly and clearly with the number of the name of Antichrist, which contains 666 as is written in Rev. 13:18.

In the same place Chytraeus added that the time of the Antichrist can be gathered from this same number of the name of the Antichrist, in which the reign of the Antichrist was confirmed by Pepin. For, there are almost the same number of years from the year 97, when John wrote the Apocalypse, until Pepin, that is, 666. Likewise the time can be gathered, in which for the first time the Roman Pope was rejected and declared to be the Antichrist by John Huss; for, there are nearly 666 years from Pepin to John Huss.

This opinion can be refuted easily, because it is based only on lies. For, first of all, Gregory was not the first one who taught that saints should be invoked and Masses offered for the dead. All the ancients taught the same things, as we have demonstrated elsewhere. Now let the example of Ambrose suffice, who preceded Gregory by 200 years, and says in his book on widows: *The angles are to be invoked,* he said, *the martyrs are to be invoked.* And in book 2, letter 8 to Faustina on the death of her sister: *Therefore,* he said, *I think that she should not be lamented so much, but helped with prayers, and you should not make yourself sad with tears, but by your prayers commend her soul to God.* Finally, Phocas did not give a universal title to the Pope, but he called him the head of the Churches. But Justinian had done the same thing much earlier in his letter to John II and also before that at the Council of Chalcedon in a letter to Leo. Therefore, without reason the coming of the Antichrist is placed at the time of Phocas.

But what Chytraeus adds concerning the number 666 is totally inept, because that number does not agree exactly with the times, in which Chytraeus wants the Antichrist to have appeared, or been confirmed, or declared. For, from Christ to the sanction of Phocas, there are 607 years, not 666. From the writing of the Apocalypse to Pepin there are 658 years, and from Pepin to John Huss there are, as he himself says, 640 years. But certainly in the Apocalypse John noted a precise number, since he also added small details. Added to this is the fact that John Huss was not the first person to say that the Pope is the Antichrist; for, Wycliffe had already done that before. In fact, John Huss never said that the Pope is the Antichrist; for, having been condemned in article 19 of Constance, he says that the clerics by their greed prepared the way for the Antichrist. Finally, all Lutherans boast that the Antichrist was detected by Luther.

The fourth opinion is that of Luther in reckoning the time; he says there are two comings of the Antichrist: one, with a spiritual sword, after the year of the Lord 600, that is, when Phocas called the Roman Pontiff the head of all the Churches; he also says there that Gregory was the last Roman Pontiff. The second coming was with a temporal sword after the year one thousand of the Lord. Bibliander teaches the same thing in Chronicles 11 and 13. Therefore, in the first coming Luther and Bibliander agree with the Centuriationists and Chytraeus, but with this difference—that Luther and Bibliander say that Gregory was a good and holy pontiff. But the Centuriationists in Centuries 6, chapter 1, col. 2 and Chyrtaeus say that Gregory above all others worked to introduce the Antichrist, and therefore was the worst, which is a horrible blasphemy. On the second coming Luther and the Centuriationists openly disagree.

This opinion, besides the common arguments that will be given later, is refuted easily. For, totally without any reason Luther situates the coming of Antichrist in the year 600 and in the year 1000; we have already spoken about the year 600 in the refutation of Chytraeus; and it can easily be proved regarding the year 1000. For, Luther places at that time the beginning of the temporal kingdom of the Antichrist, because then Pope Gregory VII deposed the Emperor Henry IV and ruled temporally and waged wars. But all these things had also happened before. For, Gregory II excommunicated Emperor Leo, and he deprived him of the kingdom of Italy in the year 715, as reported by Cedreno and Zonara in the life of the same Leo. But we have already shown the temporal rule from the year 700, that is, that the Roman Pontiffs had it three hundred years before the year one thousand.

Finally, the Magdeburgenses testify in Centuries 8, chapter 10 that Stephen III waged wars around the year of the Lord 750, and the same thing can be said about Adrian I and others of his successors. Likewise about the year 850 Leo IV, a holy man who was famous for miracles, waged war against the Saracens; he won a famous victory, and he fortified the city of Rome with towers and fortifications. He also surrounded the Vatican hill with a wall, and because of that it was called the Leonine city from his name. Almost all the historians of the time write about this, even the Magdeburgenses in Gentiles 9, chapter 10.

The fifth opinion is that of Henry Bullingerus, who in the preface to his homilies on the Apocalypse writes that the Antichrist appeared in the year of the Lord 763; this opinion disagrees with all those mentioned above, and hence it can be refuted easily, because it rests on a very weak foundation. For, Bullingerus teaches that in Rev. 13, where the number of the name of the beast is given as 666, the time of the coming of the Antichrist is signified by that number, that is, how many years after the writing of the Apocalypse the Antichrist was going to come. And since it is certain from Irenaeus in book 5 that the Apocalypse was written near the end of the reign of Domitian, that is, about the year of the lord 97, he concludes that the Antichrist would come in the year 763, for that is the number you get by adding 666 to 97.

At this point the opinion of some Catholics can be recounted, who, as Jodocus Clictovaeus says in the commentaries on book 4, chapter 28 on the Faith by John Damascene, think that the Antichrist in the proper sense was Mohammed, because he

came about the year 666, as John had predicted; but this reason is worthless. For, first of all, the Magdeburgenses object and contend that the number from the Apocalypse does not signify the time of the birth of the Antichrist, but the time of his death. But John the Evangelist in Rev. 13:18 rejects the comment both of Illyricus and Bullingerus. For, when explaining himself, he says that the number is not the number of time, but the number of the name of the Antichrist, that is, that the Antichrist will have a name, whose letters in Greek add up to the number 666, as Irenaeus in book and all the others explain it.

Furthermore, in the year 763 no change is said to have taken place concerning the Roman Pontiffs. Also Mohammed did not come then, for he was born in the year of the Lord 597. But he began to call himself a prophet in the year of Lord 623. Then he died in the year of the Lord 637, according to the testimony of Palmerius in the Chronicle. Therefore he did not reach the year 666.

The sixth opinion is that of Wolfgang Musculus, who in chapter 12 of the cited place on the Church said that the Antichrist came shortly after the time of St. Bernard, that is, around the year 1200; the proof he offers is because St. Bernard in sermon 6 on Psalm 91, after having listed the many vices of men, and especially those of ecclesiastics, and the grave persecutions of the Church, added this: *The result is that the man of sin is being revealed.*

But this opinion also is refuted easily, for St. Bernard suspected from the evils he saw that the Antichrist was near; as we said also that Cyprian, Jerome and Gregory suspected the same thing in their times. And just as their suspicion was erroneous, so also was that of Bernard. Moreover, the pontiffs without any comparison were worse from the year 900 to 1000, than they were from 1100 to 1200. Therefore, if they were not Antichrists, then who will they be?

CHAPTER IV

THE FIRST DEMONSTRATION, THAT THE ANTICHRIST HAS NOT YET COME, IS EXPLAINED

Therefore this thought is true—that he has not yet begun to rule, and that he has not yet come, but that he will come and reign near the end of the world; but when that is going to be cannot be known in any way. This thought, which destroys all the previous ones and also clearly shows that the Roman Pontiffs are not Antichrists, is proved by six reasons.

For, it should be understood that the Holy Spirit in the divine writings has given us six certain signs of the coming of the Antichrist: two preceding the Antichrist, namely, preaching the gospel in the whole world and desolation of the Roman Empire; two during his lifetime, that is, the preaching if Henoch and Elijah, and very intense persecution, so that public worship ceases totally; and two following, namely, the death of the Antichrist after three and a half years, and the end of the world. Of these we see that none of them has come to be.

Therefore the first demonstration is taken from the first sign preceding the Antichrist. The Scriptures say that the gospel must be preached in the whole world before the final persecution will come, which will be stirred up by the Antichrist: *This gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, as a testimony to all nations* (Matt. 24:14).

But that this will take place before the coming of the Antichrist can be proved for the reason that at the time of the Antichrist the cruelty of the last persecution will hinder all public exercises of the true religion.

However, because the adversaries do not admit this reason, and now is not the time to deduce it from its own principles, we will prove it from the testimonies of the Fathers. Hilary, therefore, when explaining these words of Matthew: *This gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world... and then the end will come,* clearly teaches that the Antichrist, whom he calls the abomination of desolation, will not come until the preaching of the gospel in the whole world takes place.

The same thing is taught in clear words by Cyril in the Catechism 15, by Theodoretus in comments on 2 Thess. 2, by Damascene in book 4, chapter 28, and by others; moreover, the same idea is derived from the text. For, it is said that the gospel must be preached before that great and final tribulation comes, which will be greater than what ever occurred before; the Fathers, and especially Augustine in book 20, chapters 8 and 19 teach that by this tribulation is meant the persecution of the Antichrist. But that the gospel had not been preached in the whole world by the time in which the new Samosatians say the Antichrist came, that is, around the year of the Lord 200 or 300, is clear from Origen, who in tractate 28 on Matthew says that at his time the preaching of the gospel everywhere had not yet taken place. Similarly from Ruffinus, who in book 10, chapter 9 of his History testifies that at the time of the Emperor Constantine, that is, after the year of the Lord 300, the gospel had been preached in the most distant parts of India, since before that they had never heard anything about Christ. Finally, from Augustine, who in

letter 80 says that he knew from his own certain experience that at his time there were still many nations which had heard nothing about Christ.

But that the preaching of the gospel had not been completed around the year 600 or 700, at which times the Centuriationists, Chytraeus, Luther and Bullingerus situate the coming of the Antichrist, is clear from the conversion of the Vandals, Poles, Moravians and others; it is certain that they had not heard the preaching of the gospel, until after the year of Christ 800, as even the Centurationists admit in Centuries 9, chapter 2, columns 15 and 18, and in Centuries 10, chapter 2, columns 18 and 19. Likewise, that the preaching had not been completed at the time of St. Bernard, at which time Wolfgang Musculus placed the coming of the Antichrist, is clear from St. Bernard himself in book 3 of the Consideration, where he says that there were still in his time nations which had not heard the gospel.

Finally, experience teaches that even in our time the gospel has not been preached in the whole world. For, vast regions have been discovered in the East and West, in which there is no trace of the gospel. And it cannot be said that the faith was there, but later became extinct; for, at least some vestiges would remain, either there or in the writings of the ancients. Moreover, we know that where all the apostles preached, the places were known to many, and perhaps to all; but the new world which has now been found was not known at the time of the apostles, and has only become known shortly before our age.

Against this demonstration only one objection can be made: namely, because perhaps the Scriptures, which say that the gospel must be preached in the whole world, are not speaking about the whole world simply, but by a figure of speech they are taking the whole for a part, as in Luke 2:1 where it is said: *A decree went out from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled.* Otherwise what Paul says in Rom. 10:18 already in his time will be false: *Their voice has gone out to all the world.* And what he says in Col. 1:5-6: *Because of the hope laid up for you in heaven. Of this you have heard before in the word of truth, the gospel which has come to you, as indeed in the whole world it is bearing fruit and growing.* And after that: *The gospel which you have heard,* he said, *which has been preached to every creature under heaven.*

I respond that without doubt the gospel must be preached and Churches established, not figuratively but really and simply in the whole world, that is, in every nation. For, first of all, Augustine teaches this expressly in letter 80 to Hesychius, and the other cited Fathers say the same thing, and also Origen and Jerome and others in their comments on Matt. 24.

Then, this point can be proved with three reason s. First, Christ says that preaching in the whole world is a sign of the end of the world; for thus he adds: *And then the end will come.* But if the gospel must be preached in the whole world not really, but by synecdoche, then that sign would not have any worth: for, in that way, in the first 20 years the gospel was preached by the apostles in the whole world. Secondly, as Augustine argues, in the proper sense all the nations have been promised to Christ in Ps. 72:11: *All the nations wills serve him.* And Christ generally has died for all, and therefore in Rev. 7:9 the elect are described as being from every nation, and people, and tribe and tongue; therefore the preaching also must really be general. Finally, in Matt. 24 it is said that the

gospel must be preached *as a testimony to all nations,* that is, so that no nation on the day of judgment can excuse its unbelief under the pretext of ignorance; therefore before the general judgment, general preaching must precede.

Augustine responds to those texts of Paul in his letter 80, and he says that Paul, when he says in Rom. 10, *their voice has gone out to all the world,* accepted the past for the future, as David did, for those are his words. But when he says in Col. 1, *the gospel which is in the whole world,* he did not want to say that it is so actually, but virtually, that is, because the seed of the word of God had been cast into the world by the apostles, which gradually bearing fruit and increasing, will fill the whole world. It is like someone, who started fires in different parts of the city, truly could be said to have burned the whole city, because he started a fire, which by increasing gradually, consumed the whole city. And the Apostle indicates this same thing when he says, *in the whole world it is bearing fruit and growing:* for it had not really occupied the whole world, since it still had to be proclaimed, and still in its own certain way it had occupied it, that is, virtually but not actually.

It could also be responded with Jerome on Matt. 20 and with St. Thomas on Rom. 10 that the gospel reached all nations in two ways: in one way by rumor or news; in another way by real preachers and the foundation of Churches. Certainly in the first way it reached all nations of the known world during the time of the apostles, and that is what Paul is talking about; Chrysostom is also to be understood in this way in his comments on Matt. 24. In the second way it did not reach all nations then, but it would in its own time, and the Lord is speaking about this in Matt. 24, Luke 24 and Acts 1.

You can add finally that it is not absurd if we concede that the Lord was speaking properly and the Apostle figuratively. For the reasons whereby we are forced to accept the words of the Lord in their proper signification do not have the same force, if they are adapted to the words of St. Paul, especially since the Lord was speaking about the future and Paul about the past.

CHAPTER V

THE SECOND DEMONSTRATION IS EXPLAINED

The second demonstration is taken from the second sign preceding the time of the Antichrist, which will be the complete desolation of the Roman Empire. For it should be known that the Roman Empire finally is to be divided among ten kings, of whom none will be or will be called the king of the Romans, although all occupy certain provinces of the Roman Empire; as for example the king of Gaul, the king of Spain, the queen of England, and perhaps some others rule parts of the Roman Empire, and still they are not Roman kings or emperors; but as long as this lasts, the Antichrist cannot come.

Irenaeus in book 5 proves this from Dan. 2 and 7 and from Rev. 17. For, the succession of the principal kingdoms is described in Dan. 2 until the end of the world through a statue, whose golden head signifies the first kingdom, that is, of the Assyrians; the silver breast is the second kingdom, that is, of the Persians; its belly of bronze is the third kingdom, that is, of the Greeks; its legs of iron means the fourth kingdom, that is, of the Romans, which for a long time was in two parts, just as the two legs are long. Then from the two legs arose the ten fingers, and in them the whole statue ceased to be, namely, because the Roman Empire finally was divided among ten kings, no one of whom will be the king of the Romans, just as no finger is a leg. Indeed in chapter 7 Daniel clearly designates the same four kingdoms by the four beasts, and he adds, that ten horns will come forth from the last beast; these horns signify the last ten kings, who will come forth from the Roman Empire, but they will not be Roman Emperors, as the horns themselves come out of the beast, but they are not the beast itself.

Finally, John in 17:7 describes the beast with seven heads and ten horns, upon whom a woman was sitting, and he explains that the woman is a large city, which sits upon seven hills, that is, Rome; the seven heads are those seven hills, and also seven kings, by which number all the Roman Emperors are understood. He says that the ten horns are ten kings, who at one time will reign together, and lest we should think that they will be Roman kings, he adds that these kings will hate fornication, and will cause desolation, because they so divide up the Roman Empire among themselves that they totally destroy it.

Then the same thing is proved from Paul in 2 Thess. 2:6-8 where he says: *And you know what is restraining him now so that he may be revealed in his time... only he who now restrains it will do so until he is out of the way. And then the lawless one will be revealed, etc.* There Paul does not attempt openly to write about the ruin of the Roman Empire, but what he openly had explained for them, he says in this way and the meaning is: Do you know what is hindering the coming of the Antichrist? For I told you that the Roman Empire hinders him, for its sins are not yet completed, and the Antichrist will not come before that, but eventually he will destroy this empire because of its sins. Therefore, he who now rules the Roman Empire, let him rule until it is destroyed, and then the man of lawlessness will be revealed. The Greek and Latin Fathers give this explanation; Cyril in Catechism 15, while arguing about this place said: *The predicted Antichrist will come*

when the time of the Roman Empire has been completed; Chrysostom concerning this place said: *When the Roman Empire has been destroyed, then the Antichrist will come.* Theophylact and Oecumenius say similar things.

Among the Latins, Tertullian in chapter 32 of his Apology says that Christians are praying for the long duration of the Roman Empire, because they know that, when the empire has been destroyed, a great calamity will happen to the world; and Lactantius in book 7, chapter 15, while explaining what will precede the Antichrist and the end of the world, said: *The Roman name by which the world is now ruled (my mind hates to say this, but I will say it because it will happen) will be removed from the earth, and the empire will return to Asia, and again the Orient will dominate, and the West will serve it.* Ambrose in comments on 2 Thess. 2 says that the Antichrist will come after the defeat and destruction of the Roman kingdom.

Jerome in question 11 to Algasia, commenting on the same place of Paul, said: *For unless there comes a revolt first, so that all nations, which are subject to the Roman Empire, depart from it; and unless the Roman Empire is already destroyed, and the Antichrist has preceded, Christ will not come; only when the Roman Empire, which now rules all the nations, fails and is destroyed, then the Antichrist will come.* Finally Augustine in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God,* explains the same place in this way *Only he who now reigns, let him reign until he be taken out of the way; and then shall the wicked be revealed, and no one doubts that this means Antichrist.*

But that this sign was not fulfilled in those times, at which time the Transylvanian Antitrinitarians say that the Antichrist did come, that is, about the year 200, is clear, because the Roman Empire was flourishing at that time and for a long time afterwards.

Also that it has never been terminated up to the present time is clear, because the succession still remains, and the name of the Roman Emperors; and by the wonderful providence of God, when the Empire failed in the West, which was the one leg of that statue of Daniel, the empire remained safe and sound in the East, which was the other leg. But because the empire of the East was to be destroyed by the Turks, as we now see is a fact, God again raised in the West the former leg, that is, the western kingdom of Charlemagne and this empire still exists.

There is no obstacle in the fact that Rome herself, according to the prophecy of John, in a certain sense fell and lost the empire. For, the Roman Empire without the city of Rome can very well exist, and he who lacks Rome can be said to be the Roman Emperor, provided that he succeeds another Roman Emperor in the same dignity and power, whether he has under his power several provinces or only a few. Otherwise neither Valens, nor Arcadius, nor Theodosius the Younger, nor their other successors until Justinian, all of whom lacked Rome, could not be called Roman Emperors. Also Charlemagne and his successors, who did not possess the city of Rome, would not have been the emperors, and it is clear that this is false for two reasons.

First, because for this reason alone the emperor, who is now ruling, precedes all Christian kings, even if they are greater and more powerful. Next, because it is certain that, with the consent of the Romans, Charlemagne was created emperor, according to the testimony of Deacon Paul in book 23 on the Restoration of Rome, and by the

Greek emperor himself he was greeted as emperor by his legates, according to Ado in the Chronicle for the year 810; he was also showered with gifts as emperor by the Persians and Arabs, according to Otto Frisingensis in book 5, chapter 31. Finally, Lutherans glory in the fact that they have three princes as electors of the Roman Emperor; therefore they cannot deny that the Roman Empire still exists.

Rightly, therefore, Orosius in book 2, chapter 4, when comparing the Babylonian Empire with the Roman, says: God dealt much more gently with the Romans than he did with the Babylonians. For, after 1164 years, from the time Babylon was founded, in one day Babylon was captured, the emperor was killed, and the empire was destroyed. But after the same number of years, that is 1164, from the time Rome began to exist, Rome was captured by the Goths, but the Emperor Honorius, who was reigning at the time, remained safe and the Roman Empire was saved.

Hence the deception of the adversaries is evident. For they thought the decline of the Roman Empire was sufficient for the coming of Antichrist; but Paul, John and Daniel, and the Fathers Irenaeus, Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Tertullian, Lactantius, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine say that not the decline but the desolation is necessary.

But Luther, Illyricus and Chytraeus object that this demonstration is very much in their favor; for it was predicted by John in Rev. 13 that the Beast, which signifies the Roman Empire, would suffer a mortal wound, and then would be healed by the Antichrist And this is what happened, since the Pope re-established the Western Empire, which at the time had almost perished, when he conferred on Charlemagne the title and dignity of emperor; therefore from this veiy change and restoration of the empire it is manifestly deduced that the Roman Pope truly is the Antichrist. On this see Illyricus in the book against the primacy of the Pope, and Centuries 8, chapter 10, col. 751, and Chytraeus on chapter 13 of the Apocalypse. Illyricus confirms this argument from Ambrose who, while explaining the words of St. Paul in 2 Thess. 2, says that the Antichrist will return freedom to the Romans but under his own name: it seems that the Pope did this, since he created an emperor for the Romans, but made him dependent on himself.

I respond: We read nowhere in John that the beast is to be healed by the Antichrist, which signifies the Roman Empire; but we read this—that one of the heads of the beast will die, and shortly thereafter will be resurrected by the power of the dragon, that is, of the devil. Almost all the ancients explain this as being about the Antichrist, who pretends to be dead, and with diabolical cleverness brings himself back to life, in order to imitate the true death and resurrection of Christ; and in this way he seduces many.

St. Gregory explains it in this way in book 11, letter 3, and also Primasius, Bede, Hymo, Anselm, Richard, and Rupert in their comments on Rev. 13. And the text itself makes it plainly clear that by the head of the beast, which died and came back to life, we do not understand it to be Charlemagne, but the Antichrist. Since that head, as John writes, had power only for forty-two months, and blasphemed God and those who dwell in heaven, and ruled over every tribe and people, and tongue and nation, and all on earth adored it—we see none of these things, nor do we read about them in the life of Charlemagne, or in any of his successors. For, Charlemagne reigned for much longer

than forty-two months; he did not blaspheme God and the saints, but rather he honored them in a wonderful way, and many of his successors imitated his piety.

Finally, Charlemagne himself did not, nor any of his successors, exercise dominion over every tribe, people, tongue and nation, as is well known by all. In addition, St. Ambrose does not say that a new Roman Emperor will be created by the Antichrist, which the Pope did; but that after the fall of the Roman Empire freedom would be restored to the Romans, which the Pope is not said to have done.

CHAPTER VI

THE THIRD DEMONSTRATION IS EXPLAINED

The third demonstration is taken from the coming of Enoch and Elijah, who are still living, and they are living for the purpose of opposing the coming Antichrist, of preserving those chosen in the faith of Christ, and finally of converting the Jews; but it is certain that this has not yet taken place. There are four texts of Scripture about this matter. The first is Mal. 4:5: *Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers.* The second is Sir. 48:9-10, where we read about Elijah: *You who were taken up by a whirlwind of fire, in a chariot of horses of fire; you who are ready at the appointed time, it is written, to calm the wrath of God before it breaks out in fury, to turn the heart of the father to the son, and to restore the tribes of Jacob.* And in chapter 44:16: *Enoch pleased the Lord, and was taken up; he was an example of repentance to all generations.* The third is Matt. 17:11: *Elijah does come, and he is to restore all things.* The fourth is Rev. 11:3: *I will grant my two witnesses power to prophesy for one thousand two hundred and sixty days.*

Theodore Bibliander also cites all these places in book 14 of his Chronicle, but he says that by Enoch and Elijah all the faithful ministers are understood, whom God stirs up during the time of the Antichrist, like Luther, and Zwingli and others; and finally he concludes by saying: *Therefore it is childish imagination, or a Jewish dream, to wait for either Elijah or Enoch as definite persons with their individual characteristics.* Chytraeus teaches the same thing in his commentary on this text in Rev. And they offer this proof: because the things said about Elijah by Malachi the Lord said are to be understood about John in Matt. 11:14: *He is Elijah who is to come.* And Jerome in comments on Mal. 4:5 explains that it is about the whole choir of prophets, that is, about the teaching of all the prophets.

But to us it does not seem to be childish imagination, but a true statement—that Enoch and Elijah will come in their own persons, and that the contrary is either a heresy or an error proximate to heresy, and this is proved first of all from those four Scripture texts. For, that Malachi's words cannot be understood to be about some teachers, like Luther, Zwingli, and other like them, is clear; for, Malachi says that the Jews will be converted by Elijah, and that he is to be sent especially for the sake of the Jews, as is clear from this: *I will send to you,* and from Sirach: *To restore the tribes of Jacob;* but Luther and Zwingli did not convert any Jews.

Also, that these words cannot be understood to be about John the Baptist literally, but only about Elijah, is clear, because Malachi is speaking about the second coming of the Lord, which will be for judgment, for he says this: *Before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes.* For, the first coming is not called the great and terrible day, but the acceptable time, the day of salvation, hence also he adds: *Lest I come and smite the land with a curse,* that is, lest coming for judgment, and finding all the wicked, I condemn all the earth. Therefore, I will send Elijah so that I may have some whom I will save. But in

the first coming the Lord came not to judge, but to be judged; not to condemn, but to save.

Later on a response will be given to the words of the Lord in Matt. 11:14. Regarding Jerome I say that, although in his commentary on Malachi he did not think that Malachi was speaking about the real Elijah, nevertheless in his commentary on Matt. 11 and 17 he thought and taught the contrary. Finally, Augustine in book 20, chapter 29 of *The City of God* testifies to the fact that this is the common interpretation of the faithful.

Now it will be proved that Sirach also is speaking about the persons themselves of Henoch and Elijah, not about some other persons. For, Sirach says that Enoch will come *to give repentance to the Gentiles, and he was taken up into paradise;* and that Elijah will come to restore the tribes of Israel, who was taken up by a whirlwind of fire, in a chariot of horses of fire; these things certainly pertain only to these particular persons.

In this place I find it astonishing what entered into the mind of Jansen, since in explaining this place he wrote: although it is the opinion of all the ancient authors that Elijah will come, nevertheless I am not convinced by this place; for, it could be said that Sirach wrote that according to the accepted opinion of his own time, when it was believed because of Malachi's words that Elijah truly would come in his own person before the Messiah, since it was not to be fulfilled in his own person, but in him who would come in the spirit and power of Elijah. For if that is true, as Jansen says: then it follows that Sirach erred, and wrote what is false. But, if I am not mistaken, Jansen changed his opinion; for, when writing about Matt. 17 he teaches that the text of Malachi cannot be understood literally, except about the true Elijah, and he is forced to say the same thing about the text of Sirach, which without doubt explains Malachi.

Now it is evident that the words of the Lord in Matt. 17 are to be understood about the true Elijah, not about John the Baptist, because John had already come, and finished his course, and still the Lord says: *Elijah will come.* But it can be proved that these words are not to be understood about all teachers, but about the one true Elijah. First, because the apostles who raised the question about Elijah were Peter, James and John, and they took the occasion from the Transfiguration of the Lord, where they saw Moses and Elijah. Therefore when they ask: *Why do the scribes say that first Elijah must come?,* they are speaking about the Elijah whom they had seen on the mountain with Christ. Therefore Christ in responding, *Elijah indeed will come, and he will restore all things,* is also speaking about that particular Elijah, who appeared at the transfiguration. Secondly, the same thing is clear from the words, *and he will restore all things.* For, John the Baptist did not do that, nor did any other person. For, to restore all things is to recall all Jews, and heretics, and perhaps many Catholics deceived by the Antichrist back to the true faith.

But Bibliander objects, because the Lord in Matt. 11 says about John the Baptist, *he is Elijah who is to come,* as if he were to say: He is Elijah promised by Malachi. I respond that the Lord wants to say that John was the promised Elijah, not literally, but allegorically; for he said just before that, *if you are willing to accept it,* as if he were to say: Elijah indeed promised in his own person will come in the final coming, but if you wish to have an Elijah for the first coming, accept John. Therefore also he added: *He who has ears to hear, let him hear,* indicating that what he had said was a mystery, namely, that John was Elijah.

Finally, that the words of John in Rev. 11 are to be understood about the individual persons Enoch and Elijah, and not about all teachers, is clear from the fact that there John says that they are to be killed by the Antichrist, and that their bodies will remain unburied for three days on a street of Jerusalem, and after three days they will rise from the dead, and ascend into heaven, and none of these things have happened so far.

However, David Chytraeus attempts to respond in his comments on this place, and first of all he says that John wanted to say that many Lutheran ministers would be killed by the papists; but God restored life to them, since God took them to heaven to live forever. Secondly, he adds shortly thereafter that, after those ministers have been killed, the life of the body is to be restored to them on the last day of the resurrection. Thirdly and finally, he adds in the same place that it could also mean that, by this restoration to life, we shall see many other ministers raised up by God with the same zeal and virtue in order to replace those killed.

But these responses are too trivial. For, the first one cannot be defended, because the beatitude of the soul is not the restoration of lost life, but the obtaining of a new life. Then those two witnesses in the Apocalypse resurrect in the sight of all, and in body they will be raised on high, which certainly is not fulfilled in the beatitude of the soul.

The second answer also has no worth. For, John says that those two witnesses will resurrect before the last day, that is, still during the course of this world. For, John adds that a great fear will strike their enemies at the sight of their resurrection; and shortly thereafter there will be a great earthquake, and seven thousand people will be killed. Finally, the third answer misses the point. For, Scripture says that those same men who had died were raised up and ascended into heaven. But so far we have not seen any Lutheran minister rise from the dead, or be assumed into heaven. Now John says that Enoch and Elijah are going to preach clothed in sackcloth, and the Lutherans so hate sackcloth, that if perhaps they should have it when they become Lutherans, they immediately discard it.

It is proved secondly from the consensus of the Fathers that Elijah and Enoch will come during the time of the Antichrist in their true persons. For, that is said about Elijah by Hilary, Jerome, Origen, Chrysostom, and all the other interpreters of Matt. 17. The same thing is said by Lactantius in book 7, chapter 17, by Theodoretus in comments on Mal. 4, by Augustine in tractate 4 on John, and by Primasius on Rev. 11.

Many who comment on the book of Revelation say the same thing about Henoch and Elijah together, like Bede, Richard and Arethas, who also adds that it is believed invariably by the whole Church that Enoch and Elijah will come so that they can oppose the Antichrist. Likewise Damascene in book 4, chapter 28, Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world; also St. Gregory in book 14, chapter 11 and 12, and in book 9, chapter 4 on Morality, and St. Augustine in book 9, chapter 6 in his book on Genesis.

It is proved thirdly because otherwise a reason cannot be give why those two were taken up before their death, and still live in mortal flesh, at some time destined to die. For, although the Jews, like Rabbi Salomon on Gen. 5 say that Enoch was killed before the time, because he was soft and mutable, and they say that Elijah, when he was carried on high in the fieiy chariot was burned up completely by that fire; and perhaps the Lutherans

who deny they will return say the same thing, nevertheless all Catholics hold with certain faith that both of them are alive in their own bodies. For, the Apostle teaches in Heb. 11:5 that Enoch did not die. He was taken up so that he should not see death; and that both he and Elijah are not dead, but still are going to die is clearly taught, in addition to those cited above, by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine and Epiphanius.

Irenaeus in book 5, when speaking about Enoch and Elijah, said this: *The priests, who are the disciples of the apostles, say that those who were taken up to that place* (to the earthly paradise) *were taken up and there shall they who have been translated remain until the consummation [of all things], as a prelude to immortality.* Tertullian, in chapter 2 of his book against the Jews, concerning Enoch said this: *He has not yet tasted death, so he is a candidate for eternity.* Epiphanius in the Anchoratus said this about Enoch and Elijah: *These two remain in body and soul because of their hope.* Jerome in his letter to Pammachius against John of Jerusalem said: *Henoch was translated in the flesh, and Elijah still in the flesh was taken up into heaven; they are not yet dead, and now they dwell in paradise, etc.* Augustine in chapter 23 of his book on original sin said: *We do not doubt that Enoch and Elijah are living in the bodies with which they were born.*

CHAPTER VII

THE FOURTH DEMONSTRATION IS EXPLAINED

The fourth demonstration is taken from the certain fact that the persecution of the Antichrist will be very intense and widespread, so that all public ceremonies of religion and sacrifices will cease; so far we have seen nothing like this. That the future final persecution will be very grave is clear from what Matt, says in 24:21 : *Then there will be great tribulation, such as has not been from the beginning of the world until now.* And from Rev. 20:7 where we read: *Satan will be loosed,* who up until that time was bound.

When considering this text Augustine says in book 20, chapters 8 and 9 of *The City of God Xhai* the devil will be loosed during the time of Antichrist, and therefore that the persecution will be much more serious than all the previous ones, because the loosed devil can rage more cruelly than when he was bound. Therefore he says that then the devil will attack the Church with all his force and that of his followers. And Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world and Cyril in Catechism 15 say that the martyrs, whom the Antichrist will kill, will be more illustrious than all of the past ones, because the past ones fought against men as servants of the devil, but the future ones will fight against the devil himself personally harassing them. Certainly we have not experienced anything like this since the year 600 or even since the millennium.

Now the heretics say that they have suffered a great persecution from the Antich^ because at times some of their members have been burned. But what kind of a comparison is this with the persecution of Nero, Domitian, Decius, Diocletian and others? Since for one heretic who is burned, formerly a thousand Christians were killed; and that was carried out in the whole Roman world, not just in one province. It is of course a great punishment for a man to be burned, but then incredible and diverse kinds of torments were inflicted. On these torments see Cornelius Tacitus on Nero, and from our authors Eusebius in his Ecclesiastical History.

Damasus writes in the life of Marcellinus that more than 17,000 Christians were killed in one month by Diocletian. And Eusebius, who was living at that time, writes in book 8, chapter 6 of his history that all the prisons were so full of martyrs, that no place remained more nefarious. In that whole book he says that so many were crowned with martyrdom during a period of two years that it is impossible to count them. You can add to this that our heretics have killed many more Catholics in France and Flanders during the past ten or fifteen years than the Inquisitors did the same to heretics during the past hundred years. Therefore, they cannot call this a persecution, but rather a civil war; for, as Augustine says in letter 80 to Hesychius, when the real persecution of Antichrist will take place, the tribulation will be only for the children of the Church; but not for their persecutors, as in the time of Diocletian; Christians only were killed, but they did not kill others.

But if it must be called a persecution, it is the Catholics who are suffering it rather than the Lutherans and Calvinists. For, it is the Catholics who have been expelled from many provinces, who have lost their Churches, patrimony, and even their own homeland;

that is, the new ministers of that gospel have taken possession of things that did not belong to them. For, as we have said, and as can be known from the writings of Laurence Surius and from other historians of this time, within a few years the fuiy of the Calvinists has destroyed more Catholics than the heretics have suffered by the judgment of Catholic princes because of their loss of faith.

But that the future persecution will be widespread and manifest Augustine proves in book 20, chapter 11 in *The City of God* from the words in Revelation 20:9: *And they surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city.* For with these words it is signified that absolutely all the wicked will be together in the army of Antichrist, and they will declare open war against every Church of the saints. For now there are many feigned Catholics in the Church who, while hiding their malice, in their heart really are outside the Church, while physically they are in it. *Then all will come out,* Augustine said, *into open persecution because of their secret hatred.* This surely has not happened to such an extent in this time that almost never was there a larger number of false brothers, and this persecution is not known and manifest to such an extent that neither those who say they are suffering it, nor we who are said to inflict it can say when it began.

Certainly the persecutions of Nero, Domitian and the other leaders of the Romans have been carefully recorded in writing by Eusebius, Orosius and Sulpitius. And there is no doubt about when they began, and when they stopped; as also concerning the coming of Christ, because it was true and manifest; and we know very well when it happened anc to whom it was first made known; and among us there are no different opinions about this matter. But the heretics, who say the Antichrist has come, and already for many years has carried on a persecution, still cannot produce one author, who noted down when the Antichrist came, or to whom he first appeared, or when he began the persecution. And they so disagree among themselves that one says he came in the year 200, another in the year 600, another in the year 773, another in the year 1000, another in the year 1200, so that they do not seem to be speaking as vigilant observers, but rather as dreamers in a quiet sleep.

Finally, Daniel 12:11 openly teaches that at the time of Antichrist, because of the fierceness of the persecution, the public and daily worship and sacrifice of the Church will be stopped: *From the time that the continual burnt offering is taken away... there will be 1290 days.* By the agreement of all, there he is speaking about the time of the Antichrist, and according to Irenaeus in book 5, Jerome and Theodoretus on this text, Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world, and Primasius on Rev. 11 the meaning is this: the Antichrist will stop all divine worship, which is now performed in the Churches of Christians, and especially the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist. But experience tells us that this sign has not yet taken place.

From these arguments three conclusions can be drawn. First, that the Antichrist has not yet come, since the continual sacrifice is still going on. Second, that the Roman Pontiff is not the Antichrist, but actually very much opposed to him, since the sacrifice, which the latter is going to abolish, is offered by him daily. Third, that the contemporary heretics, before all others, are the precursors of the Antichrist, since they seek nothing more ardently than to abolish absolutely the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

CHAPTER VIII

THE FIFTH DEMONSTRATION IS EXPLAINED

The fifth demonstration is taken from the duration of the Antichrist. The Antichrist will reign for only three and a half years. But the Pope has already reigned spiritually in the Church for more than 1500 years, and no one can be singled out, who is recognized as the Antichrist, who has reigned for exactly three and a half years. Therefore the Pope is not the Antichrist, and so the Antichrist has not yet come.

In addition, that the reign of the Antichrist will be for three and a half years is gathered from Dan. 7:25 and 12:7. And from Rev. 12:6, where we read that the kingdom of the Antichrist will continue for a time, for times, and for a half time. For, by the word "time" is understood one year, by "times" two years, by a "half time" and half year. For the same John explains it in this way. For, in Rev. 11 and 13 he says that the Antichrist will reign for 42 months, which add up to three and a half years. And in chapter 11 he says that Enoch and Elijah are going to preach for 1260 days, which adds up to the same time. For, the Hebrews use lunar years and months, although they corrected them to the solar by adding every sixth year one lunar month; so three and a half lunar years add up to 42 months, or 1260 days, since the full and lunar year consists of twelve months, each one of which has 30 days, as Augustine says in book 15, chapter 14 of *The City of God.*

There is no contradiction in the fact that in Daniel 12:11 the Antichrist is said to reign 1290 days, that is, 30 days more than John said. For, John is speaking about Enoch and Elijah, who will be killed by the Antichrist one month before the Antichrist perishes.

To these points the adversaries give three responses. First, Chytraeus on chapters 11 and 13 of Revelation says that these times cannot be accepted for three and a half years because it is contrary to experience, and Paul says in 2 Thess. 2:3 that the Antichrist will continue until the coming of Christ.

Secondly, he says that a certain time is placed for uncertain time, and therefore for 42 months or 1260 days more than a thousand years should be understood. Bullingerus in Sermon 46 on the Apocalypse says the same thing, and the reason for this seems to be what Luther suggests in Reckoning the time, namely, that it is certain from Rev. 20 that the devil was set loose in the year 1000; therefore the coming of Antichrist with the temporal sword took place in the year 1000 after Christ; so he has already reigned now for more than 500 years; therefore it is necessary to understand that those 42 months signify an uncertain time.

Thirdly, the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 438 respond that Daniel and John understand a day to be a year; and so for a thousand two hundred and sixty days 1260 years should be understood. The reason for this can be, because in Dan. 9 the seventy weeks are understood by all to be seventy weeks of years, not of days. And in Ezek. 4:6 it is said: *I assigned you a day for a year.* And in Luke 13:33: *I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following,* that is, to live for three years. Chytraeus gives this reason in Rev. 11:3, where he says that the years and months of this kind are called angelic, not human.

But contraiy to this is the common opinion of the old Fathers who say that, because of the places cited, the Antichrist will reign only for three and a half years. Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world said: *The Antichrist will reign over the world for three and a half years, after which his kingdom and glory will be taken from him.* Irenaeus near the end of book 5 said: *He will reign for three years and six months, and then the Lord will come from heaven.* And Jerome in his comments on Dan. 7: *A time,* he said, *signifies a year, times, according to the Hebrew way of speaking, refers to two years; but half of a time means six months, during which time the saints will be subject to the power of the Antichrist.* Cyril in Catechism 15 said: *The Antichrist will reign for three and half years only, and we say this not from the apocryphal books, but from the prophet Daniel.* And Augustine in book 20, chapter 23 of *The City of God* said: *He who reads this passage, even half asleep, cannot fail to see that the kingdom of Antichrist shall fiercely, though for a short time assail the Church, before the last judgment of God shall introduce the eternal reign of the saints. For it is patent from the context that the "time, times, and half a time," means a year, and two years, and a half year, that is to say, three years and a half. Sometimes in Scripture the same thing is indicated by months.* Similar explanations are given by Theodoretus on Dan. 7, and Primasius, Bede, Anselm, Hymo, Arethus, Richard and Rupert on the Apocalypse.

Secondly, the same thing is proved because the Scriptures say that the time of the devil on the loose and of the Antichrist will be very brief, Rev. 12:12: *Woe to you, O earth and sea, for the devil has come down to you in great wrath, because he knows that his time is short.* And Rev. 20:2-3: *He bound him for a thousand years... after that he must be loosed for a little while.* How, I ask, can this be true, it the Antichrist will reign for 1260 years? For then he will be loosed longer than he is bound.

Thirdly, because, as Augustine argues in book 20, chapter 8 of *The City of God* and Gregoiy in book 33, chapter 12 of his Morality, if that fierce persecution were not shortened many would perish, who should not perish. Hence also the Lord says in Matt. 24:22: *If those days had not been shortened, no human being would be saved;* but how can that be short which lasts more than a thousand years?

Fourthly. Christ preached only for three and a half years. Therefore it is also fitting that the Antichrist should not be allowed to preach longer.

Fifthly, because the sum of the thousand two hundred and sixty years, which the adversaries have calculated, in no way can be accommodated to the words of Daniel and John: *a time, and times, and a half time.* For, by a "time" without doubt one particular number must be understood, like one day, one week, one month, one year, one lustrum, one jubilee, one millennium; but if we take it for one millennium, then the Antichrist will reign for three thousand five hundred years, which the adversaries do not admit. If we take it for a century, the time of the Antichrist will be three hundred and fifty years, which they also do not admit. The same holds for one jubilee, etc.

Sixthly, because since in Dan. 4 we read often that seven times will happen during which Nebuchadnezzar will be outside his kingdom; by those "times" all authors understand seven years. For if we want to understand them as years of years, as the adversaries understand them, when they are considering the Antichrist, then it would

be necessary to say that Nebuchadnezzar lived outside his kingdom two thousand five hundred and fifty-five years.

And it is not difficult to refute these petty reasons; for, when Chytraeus says that the three and a half years, about which Daniel and John are speaking, cannot be accepted, properly for the type of years we are familiar with, because experience teaches us that the Antichrist has already been active for a much longer time, obviously he is begging the question, as the logicians say. For he is assuming what has to be proved: for the question is whether or not the Antichrist has already come. But when he adds that the Antichrist according to the view of Paul will reign until the second coming of Christ, and from that concludes that it is necessary for him to reign longer than three and a half years, he does not see that he is either begging the question again or saying nothing. For, that consequence can have no effect, unless it is assumed that the Antichrist has already come; but this is what is in question.

But concerning the fact that both he and Henry Bullingerus say that in this place a certain number is taken for an uncertain one, I respond: only then is a certain number taken for an uncertain one, when a full and perfect number is expressed, like 10, 100, 1000, but not when various numbers are assigned, where large and small numbers are mixed together. Therefore, then a certain number must be taken for an uncertain, when Scripture says in Rev. 20:2 that the devil was bound for 1000 years, as Augustine explains in book 20, chapter 8 of *The City of God* and Gregory in book 33, chapter 12 of his Morality, but not when a time, times and a half time are assigned, or 1260 days, or 42 months. For to what purpose is there a variety of numbers, if an uncertain time is designated?

To the argument of Illyricus I say that indeed in Scripture is found and rightly said weeks of years, but not days for years, or months of years. For, we read about weeks of years in Lev. 25:8: *You shall count seven weeks of years, etc.* And it is clear that this is said rightly, for a week is named from the number seven in Greek, Latin and Hebrew. For the Hebrews say spw *seventh,* from which is *seven,* as also in Greek it is said with ἑβδομας, and in Latin *septimana* from the number seven. Therefore, just as seven days are called a week of days, so seven years are called a week of years. But nowhere do we read about a month of years, or a day for a year, nor would it be said correctly; for a month is not named for a number, but from the course of the moon, which is completed in 30 days. Hence the Hebrews call a month ΤΠ, that is, *Moon,* or ttrnn, that is, *innovation,* namely, of the Moon; and in Greek the month is called μην, because the Moon is called μηνη.

Similarly, day does not signify a number, but the time of light in Gen. 1:5: *God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night.* And there is no contradiction in the words in Ezek. 4:6:*I assigned you a day for a year.* For he does not want to say that the days literally signify years, otherwise it would be necessary for Ezekiel to have slept on his left side for 390 years, which is impossible; for, God had ordered that he sleep on his left side for 390 days, and he added: *I assigned you a day for a year.* Therefore if those days are taken for years, Ezekiel would have to sleep on his left side for 390 years, but he did not even live that long. Therefore it must be said that "day" there truly is taken for days, but are said to be given for years, because there was a sign in those 390 days.

during which Ezekiel slept, of the sleeping of God during which he tolerated the sins of the Israelites for 390 years.

To the objection that Chytraeus makes from Luke 13:33, *I must go on my way today and tomorrow and the day following,* that is, I will live for three years, I respond that it is not meant by those words (as the adversaries erroneously say) that Christ would still preach for three more years when he uttered those words, since the Lord spoke those words in the last year of his life. For, as Jerome writes in his book on the Scriptures regarding John, and the matter itself makes clear—Matthew, Mark and Luke did not write down the deeds and words of Christ during his first two years, but only of the third year. Therefore the Lord by those three days, understood either the triduum, which he was to spend in his journey to Jerusalem, as Albert and Cajetan explain it, or certainly by that way of speaking he wanted to signify that he would still live for a short time, and would continue to preach, as Jansen rightly says. Therefore, let Illyricus and Chytraeus try to see where they might find the angelic days and months; for in Scripture they are nowhere to be found.

CHAPTER IX

THE SIXTH DEMONSTRATION IS EXPLAINED

The sixth demonstration is taken from the last sign following the Antichrist, which will be the end of the world. For, the coming of the Antichrist will be a short time before the end of the world. Therefore, if the Antichrist has already come, as the adversaries say, the world should already have ended. Daniel in chapter 7 speaks twice about the Antichrist: once while narrating his vision, and once while explaining the vision, and in both places he adds: after the Antichrist the final judgment will follow immediately: *I considered the horns,* he said, *and behold, there came up among them another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots... I looked, thrones were placed and one that was ancient of days took his seat, etc.* And after that explaining the vision: *As for the fourth beast,* he said, *there shall be a fourth kingdom on earth... as for the ten horns, out of this kingdom ten kings shall arise, and another shall arise after them; he shall be different from the former ones, and shall put down three kings... and they shall be given into his hand for a time, two times, and half a time. But the court shall sit in judgment, etc.*

There is a similar prophesy in Rev. 20:3-4: *After that he must be loosed for a little while. Then I saw thrones, and seated on them were those to whom judgment was committed, etc.* And again the same Daniel, after he had said in chapter 12 that the Antichrist would reign for a thousand two hundred and ninety days, adds this: *Blessed is he who waits and comes to the thousand three hundred and thirty-five days,* that is, for the 45 days after the death of Antichrist. For then the Lord will come for judgment, and he will confer crowns of justice on the victors, as Jerome and Theodoretus explain in their commentaries on this place.

Then the same notion is gathered from Matt. 24:14: *This gospel of the kingdom will be preached throughout the whole world, as a testimony to all nations; and then the end will come,* that is, a little while afterwards there will be the end of the world. And after that: *Immediately after the tribulation of those days the sun will be darkened, and the moon will not give its light... and then will appear the sign of the Son of man, etc.* The same is said in 2 Thess. 2:8: *Then the lawless one will be revealed, and the Lord Jesus will slay him with the breath of his mouth and destroy him by his appearing and his coming, etc.* There the Apostle is teaching that Christ will come almost immediately after the Antichrist, because there will be a brief time in between, and the deceits and frauds of the Antichrist, which will have begun to be destroyed by Elijah and Enoch, will be completely destroyed by the coming itself of Christ and the terrible preceding signs.

Finally, the same idea is given in 1 John 2:18: *Children, it is the last hour; and as you have heard that Antichrist is coming, so now many antichrists have come; therefore we know that it is the last hour.* There John is saying that the time from Christ to the end of the world is the last hour, that is, the last time, or the last age, as Augustine explains it. And he proves it beautifully from this principle, because we know that the Antichrist will come at the end of the world; for John is making this argument: We know that the

Antichrist will come at the end of the world; but now we see that already there are many of his precursors, or lesser Antichrists; therefore this is a certain sign that this is the last hour, or age. Like this is the argument about the last hour of the night: We know that the sun will rise at the end of the night; but now we see many of its rays have already brightened the air; therefore we know that this is the last hour of the night.

Finally, the same idea is found in common consensus of the Fathers: Irenaeus near the end of book 5, Tertullian in his book on the resurrection, Augustine in book 20, chapter 19 in *The City of God,* and others; and we know it also from the admission of the adversaries. For, the adversaries confess that the Antichrist will reign until the end of the world; and so a little while after his death the end of the world will take place.

Therefore from this sign, joined together with the previous one, an incontrovertible demonstration is provided, whereby it is proved that the Antichrist has not yet come, and that he is not the Roman Pontiff. For, if the world will end immediately after the death of the Antichrist, and the Antichrist will not live after he has appeared and begun to reign, except for three and a half years; therefore he will not appear, nor begin to reign, except for three and a half years before the end. For what transpires between the death of the Antichrist, and the end of the world is so small, that it can be considered as nothing. But the Pope has already reigned with both swords, even in the opinion of the adversaries themselves, more than 500 years, and nevertheless the world still exists.

CHAPTER X

ON THE NAME OF ANTICHRIST

The fourth question follows, which will be about the real name and character of the Antichrist. All admit that these words of John in Rev 13:16-18 apply absolutely to the Antichrist: *Also it causes all, both small and great, both rich and poor, both free, and slave, to be marked on the right hand or the forehead, so that no one can buy or sell unless he has the mark, that is, the name of the beast or the number of a name. This calls for wisdom: let him who has understanding reckon the number of the beast, for it is a human number, its number is 666.*

However, there are several opinions about this number. The first is of those who say that by this number it is not a name that is designated, but the time of the coming or death of the Antichrist. Thus Bullingerus who in the preface of his homily on the Apocalypse says it means the time of the coming of the Antichrist. Likewise the Magdeburgenses, who in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4 say it means the time of the death of the Antichrist. Similarly, there is the view of those who, according to Cliethoveus in book 4, chapter 28 on Damascene, say it means the time of the death of Mohammed, whom they say is the Antichrist; Lyranus agrees with them in his comments on this text. He does not think Mohammed is the Antichrist, but he thinks that by this number is meant that the death of Mohammed will be in the year 666 from the coming of Christ.

This opinion is absurd. First, because John says that he is talking about the number of the name of the beast. Second, because the beast, to whom this number belongs, will command all merchants that they use it for a sign in their contracts, and it is clear from Rev. 13 therefore that it is not the number of the death of the beast, but that it pertains to him when he is alive. Third, because it is also false that Mohammed died in the year of Christ 666. For, some say he died in the year of the Lord 637, like Matthew Palmerius; others say in the year of the Lord 630, like Cedrenus in the Compendium of History; still others say in the year of the Lord 638, like John Vaseus in the Chronicle of Spain.

The second opinion is that of David Chytraeus in his comments on Rev. 13. He says that the name of the Antichrist is λατεινος, or in Hebrew or *Roman;* and therefore that the Pope, who is a Latin prince, since he rules in Latium and is the Roman Pontiff, is the Antichrist. Theodore Bibliander teaches the same thing in tablet 10, and because of that he dedicates the eleventh tablet of his chronology, which begins with the year 600, to the Latin Popes. They give two reasons for this: one, because Irenaeus in book 5 says that it is probable that it is the future name of the Antichrist; the second reason is because really the letters of this name add up to that number, as is evident:

Ί	200	λ	30	τ	300
l	6	a	l	ε	5
μ	40	τ	300	ι	10
’	10	ε	5	τ	300
’	10	ι	10	a	l
n	400	v	50	v	50
	666	o	70		666
		ς	200		
			666		

This opinion is very temerarious. For, first of all, Irenaeus does indeed say that the name λατεινος probably can be accommodated to Antichrist; but he adds that it is much more probable that the name of Antichrist will not be λατεινος, but τειταν; this also adds up to that number, and it is a much more illustrious name, since it signifies the sun.

Moreover, this conjecture of Irenaeus, which then had some value, now has none. For he says it is probable that the Antichrist should be called Latin, not because he ruled in Latium, but because it was the Latins who then ruled far and wide and dominated the whole world. For, since the Antichrist must be a veiy powerful king, without doubt he will control the most powerful kingdom, which he finds at the time. But Irenaeus said that the most powerful kingdom is that of the Latins, because at that time they truly ruled eveiywhere. Surely that conjecture has no value now, because the Latins no longer rule in the whole world, but it is the Turks who really rule, and among us the Spaniards and the French, not the Latins.

Furthermore, the name “Latin” in order to signify “Roman,” is not written with “ei” but with a simple “i”; and then it does not add up to the number 666. Similarly the comment about the name ΓΤΗΠ can be refuted, because the word “Roman” cannot end with the letter n, since it is a masculine word, but that is a feminine ending in Hebrew. But if you take away the letter n, then 400 is removed from the number of the Antichrist. Likewise the name λατεινος, if it is the name of Antichrist, will be proper to him, as Arethas says, and used very much; for it will have to be shown as a sign by all those who buy and sell; but the word λατεινος is common. And no Pope has ever been called with the proper name of “Latin,” and this name is not even used. For the Popes have never called themselves “Latins,” but only bishops or Popes.

Also, the name “Roman” was the proper name of only one Pope; but he could not be the Antichrist, since he lived for only four months; but otherwise it is a common name.

Finally, if only the name λατεινος, or Roman, added up to 666, the adversaries would have a good point; but there are many words which add up to this same number. Hippolytus the martyr, in his Oration on the end of the world, noted another name that produces that number, namely, άρνούμαι, that is, *I deny,* Arethas found seven of them: λαμπετης, that is, *illustrious,* τειταν, that is, *sun,* όνικητης, that is, *victor,* κακός ό δηγος, that is, *a perverse leader,* άληθης βλαβερός, that is, *truly injuring,* παλαι βάσκανος, that is, *formerly envying,* άμνος άδικος, that is, *injuring lamb.* Primasius added another one: άντεμος, that is, *contrary.* Rupert, and before him Haymo, thought up two others, namely, γενσηρικος, which is a Gothic name, and DCLXVI in Latin, which makes 666, if we accept in the Latin way D for

five hundred, C for a hundred, L for fifty, X for ten, V for five, and I for one.

Of recent authors Gulielmus Lindanus, in book 3 of his work on Doubts, notes that Martin Luther came up with the number 666, if the Latin letters are taken for numbers, in the way of the Greeks and Hebrews, in this way: A 1, B 2, C 3, D 4, E 5, F 6, G 7, H 8, I 9, K 10, L 20, M 30, N 40, O 50, P 60, Q 70, R 80, S 90, T 100, V 200, X 300, Y 400, Z 500. Gilbert Genebardus in the last Chronology book noted also that the name of Luther produces that number—"nW

7	4	σ	200	I add in favor of
□	2	a	l	Luther and Chytraeus
	10	ξ	60	two others, namely,
7	4	**o**	70	ΨΡΙΠΟ 7Ο7 that is, David
D	20	**v**	50	Chytraeus, and σαξόνειος
'	10	ε	5	which produce the same number,
n	400	ι	10	and this name fits Luther, just as
n	200	**o**	70	the name "Latin" is suitable
i	10	ς	200	for the Pope.
l	6			
	666		666	

The third opinion is that of many Catholics, who think that the Antichrist should be called ἀντεμος, both because this name really suits him, and also because it adds up exactly to that number 666. This is the position of Primasius, Anselm and Richard.

This opinion in rightly refuted by Rupert, because the name that John hints at here will not be the name given to the Antichrist by his adversaries, but the name that he gives himself and in which he will be glorified, so much so that he orders it to be written on the foreheads of men. However, it is not credible that he will assume for himself a name that is odious and cheap, like the name ἀντεμος, and also almost all the other names mentioned above.

The fourth opinion is that of Rupert himself, who thinks that by this number the name of Antichrist is not signified, but what is signified is the threefold prevarication to be fulfilled in the Antichrist. For, the number six, because it does not arrive at seven, in which there is rest and beatitude, is the number of a creature by the prevarication of falling short of rest: But the devil is guilty of three prevarications, or rather he tripled one. For, in the first place, he transgressed when he himself sinned; then again when he made the first man to sin, and then to the simple six he added sixty; finally, in the third place, he will transgress, when he seduces the whole world through the Antichrist, and then he will add six hundred to the sixty.

The fifth opinion is that of Bede, who takes a different approach and says that the number six is perfect, because God made heaven and earth in six days; but sixty is more perfect, and six hundred is most perfect. From this he concludes that the Antichrist is designated by the number 666, because he will usurp for himself perfect tribute, which is due to God alone. As a sign of this matter, we read in 1 Kings 10:14 that the weight of gold that came to Solomon in one year was six hundred and sixty-six talents of gold·

These two opinions do not seem to agree properly with what John says, namely, that this number is the number of a name, not of a dignity, or of a prevarication, but those Fathers did not want their opinions to be anything other than speculations and conjectures.

Therefore, the opinion is true of those who admit their ignorance, and say that until now the name of Antichrist is unknown. This is the opinion of Irenaeus in book 5, and of Arethas in his comments on this text in Rev. and also of others. But it will be good here to quote the words of Irenaeus, since Chytraeus urges his readers to read him on this matter: *I urge,* he said, *students to peruse the last pages of Irenaeus* (333 and 334) *dealing with this place in the Apocalypse. He argues modestly and piously about this number of the beast, and among other things, and he indicates that the Antichrist will be Latin or Roman, bearing the name* λατεινος, *etc.* Irenaeus, therefore, says this: *It is therefore more certain, and less hazardous, to await the fulfilment of the prophecy, than to be making surmises, and casting about for any names that may present themselves, inasmuch as many names can be found possessing the number mentioned; and the same question will, after all, remain unsolved. For if there are many names found possessing this number, it will be asked which among them shall the coming man bear. It is not through a want of names containing the number of that name that I say this, but on account of the fear of God, and zeal for the truth: for the name Evanthas* (ΕΥΑΝΘΑΣ) *contains the required number, but I make no allegation regarding it. Then also Lateinos* (ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ) *has the number six hundred and sixty-six; and it is a very probable [solution], this being the name of the last kingdom [of the four seen by Daniel]. For the Latins are they who at present bear rule: I will not, however, make any boast over this [coincidence]. Teitan too,* (TEITAN) , *the first syllable being written with the two Greek vowels* ε *and* ι, *among all the names which are found among us, is rather worthy of credit.* And after that: *Inasmuch, then, as this name Titan has so much to recommend it, there is a strong degree of probability, that from among the many [names suggested], we infer, that perchance he who is to come shall be called Titan. We will not, however, incur the risk of pronouncing positively as to the name of Antichrist; for if it were necessary that his name should be distinctly revealed in this present time, it would have been announced by him who beheld the apocalyptic vision.*

Therefore let Chytraeus listen modestly, piously and learnedly to a different Irenaeus, and he should not falsely attribute to him what he never said. For Irenaeus did not judge that the Antichrist would be a Latin or a Roman; but he says, and repeats it several times, that the name of Antichrist at this time cannot be known, and he says this for two reasons. First, because there are many names which add up to that number, and it cannot be discerned from so many similar names which is the one that has been predicted. Then, if God wanted it to be known, he surely would have revealed in through John. But he added that he was speaking in this way not from a lack of names, but from the fear of God and zeal for the truth. Because of this he suggests three names, Ευάνθας, Λατείνος and Τειταν; of these the second is like the first, the third is affirmed by the second, but not one of them is certain.

We can also add a third reason from the same Irenaeus. For, shortly before arguing against those who deduce false names of the Antichrist from their own imagination, he says that on that account they run into many problems. For, they are exposing themselves to the danger of erring and of deceiving others, and of bringing it about that both they and

many others can be seduced easily by the Antichrist. For, when he comes, and has a name different from the one they were convinced he was going to have, he will not be taken by them to be the Antichrist, and so he will not be avoided. Without doubt all of these problems will befall the Lutherans, and especially this last one. For they have convinced themselves that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist, so when the true Antichrist comes he will not be easily recognized by them; and therefore he will not be avoided.

In this place, however, it should be noted that the name of the Antichrist will be very famous when he comes; for, even before the Antichrist comes, the Jews do not know for certain by what name he is to be called, even though the prophets have foretold many things about his name. Indeed a certain Sibyl, as it is contained in book 1 of the Songs of the Sibyls, noted the number of the name of the future Christ, and said it is 888, just as John wrote about Antichrist that his number is 666, and still men before the coming of Christ were not able to say that he was to be called Jesus. But after the coming of Christ, there is no room for controversy, and absolutely all know that he is called Jesus.

But, the Sibyl said, *I will teach* 110
what the sum is of the whole number η 8
For there are eight monads σ 200
and just as many decades in it ο 70
And eight hundreds will υ 400
signify to faithless ς 200
Men the name, and you must remember it 888

Furthermore, it is common to all the prophecies of the prophets that they are ambiguous and obscure, until they are fulfilled, as Irenaeus rightly teaches and proves in book 1, chapter 43.

From this matter an incontrovertible argument can be made to prove that the Roman Pontiff is not the Antichrist, and that the Antichrist has not yet come. For, if the Antichrist had come, and he were the Roman Pontiff, certainly it could be established from his name as predicted by John. Similarly, because our Christ has come, now there is no question about how he will be named by Turks and Jews and Pagans. But concerning the name of the Antichrist there is still much controversy, as we have made clear by the many opinions cited and refuted. Therefore, the prophecy of John has not yet been fulfilled. Therefore the Antichrist has not yet come, and so he is not the Roman Pontiff.

We can add the confirmation from the Confession of Augustine Marloratus who, in a long explanation assembled from various Lutherans and Calvinists about this text in the New Testament, writes as follows: *There are almost as many explanations of this text as there are expositors, whereby it appears that it is obscure and enigmatic.* These are his words. But if the prophecy is still obscure and enigmatic, then it has not been fulfilled. Therefore the Antichrist has not come, since all the prophecies, when they have been fulfilled, are made very clear. Therefore, why does Marloratus in his preface to the Apocalypse say that it is so obvious that the Roman Pontiff is the Antichrist that if one were to remain silent about it, the very stones would cry out?

CHAPTER XI

ON THE MARK OF ANTICHRIST

There are also two or three opinions about the mark of the Antichrist. The first is that of the contemporary heretics, who teach that the mark of the Antichrist is a sign of obedience, and of union with the Roman Pontiff; but they do not explain in the same way what that sign is. Henry Bullingerus in sermon 61 on the Apocalypse says it is the anointing of chrism, whereby all Christians obedient to the Roman Pontiff are signed on their forehead. Theodore Bibliander in Chronicles, tablet 10, says that the mark of the Antichrist is the profession of the Roman faith, so that a true cultivator of the Christian faith is not had; he does not profess that he belongs to the Roman Church. David Chytraeus, in addition to these two, adds the oath of fidelity, which many are forced to make to the Roman Pontiff; likewise the priestly anointing, which is received on the crown of the head and on the hand, *and it imprints,* he said, *as the Papists say, an indelible character.* Finally, other signs are to prostrate oneself before statues and consecrated bread, and to be present at funeral Masses.

Sebastian Meyer says similar things, and others found in the book of Augustine Marloratus on this text in the Apocalypse. But it is easy to refute these trifles, both becausd they do not agree with the words of the same text, and also because all those signs were in the Catholic Church before the Antichrist, according to their opinion, appeared.

First of all, therefore, from the text we have one future mark, not many. For, Scripture always speaks in the single number, both concerning the mark, and the name, and the number of the name of Antichrist. Therefore there will be one mark and also one proper name of the Antichrist, and there will be one number of his name. Therefore since the adversaries multiply so many marks, they are admitting that they do not know who that man is about whom John is speaking.

Secondly, that mark will be common for all men in the kingdom of Antichrist, as is clear from these words: *It causes all, both small and great, both rich and poor, both free and slave, to be marked* (Rev. 13:16). But the oath of obedience and the priestly anointing pertains to only a few.

Thirdly, Scripture indicates that the mark will be of such a kind that without discrimination it can be borne on the right hand or on the forehead, because he says this: *He will cause all to be marked on the right hand or the forehead.* But nothing of what the adversaries say is like this. For, the anointing of chrism cannot be received on the right hand. Profession of the Roman faith is made neither in the hand, nor on the forehead, but in the mouth by confession and in the heart through faith. The oath of fidelity is offered by the hand and the mouth, but in no way can it be imposed on the forehead. The priestly anointing is received neither on the right hand alone nor on the forehead, but on the crown of the head and on the fingers of both hands. Finally, to be present at funeral Masses, to prostrate oneself before statues and the Eucharist are not actions of the forehead or hands, but of the whole body, and they are manifested especially on the knees.

Fourthly, the same Scripture says that in the kingdom of Antichrist no one will be

permitted to buy or sell, unless he shows the mark, or the name, or the number of his name. But how many buy and sell in the province of the Roman Pontiff, who have not yet been anointed with chrism, have not taken the oath of fidelity, and are not priests? Is it not so that in the city of Rome, where the Roman Pontiff has his chair, many Jews publicly do business, buy and sell, but none of them have the mark?

We will now offer another reason and we will prove that all of those signs are older than the Antichrist. The Antichrist, in the opinion of the adversaries, did not come before the year of the Lord 606, but Tertullian lived about the year 200 and nevertheless he mentions the chrism in his book on the resurrection of the flesh. *The flesh,* he said, *is washed so that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed so that the soul may be consecrated.* Cyprian lived around the year 250 and he mentions the chrism in book 1, letter 12. *To be anointed,* he said, *is necessaiy for the one who is baptized, so that having received the chrism, that is, the anointing, he is the anointed of God and can have within himself the grace of Christ.* Augustine lived around the year 420 and still he says in the tractate on John 2:18: *What is it that all knew about the sign of Christ, unless it was the cross of Christ? Unless this sign is used either on the forehead of believers, or on the water itself by which they are regenerated, or on the chrism oil by which they are anointed, or in the sacrifice by which they are nourished, none of those things is done properly.*

Similarly, to belong to the Roman Church, before the year of the Lord 600, was the sign and mark of a truly Catholic man. Augustine writes in letter 162 about Caecilianus, who lived about the year of the Lord 300: *He could not care about the multitude of enemies conspiring against him, when he saw that he was united by shared letters with both the Roman Church, in which the primacy of the apostolic See was flourishing and with the other lands, whence the Gospel had come to Africa itself.* Ambrose, who lived about the year 390, in his Oration on the death of his brother Satyrus said: *He called the bishop to him, and esteeming that there can be no true thankfulness except it spring from true faith, he enquired whether he agreed with the Catholic bishops, that is, with the Roman Church?*

Victor Uticensis, who live around the year of the Lord 490, in book 1 on the persecution of the Vandals writes that an Arian priest, when he tried to persuade the king not to kill a certain Catholic man, used these words: *If you kill him with the sword, the Romans will begin to proclaim him as a martyr.* In that context, by the name of the Romans, African Catholic were designated, who certainly were called Romans by the Arians for no other reason but that they followed the faith of the Roman Church and not the Arian falsehood.

The oath of obedience made to the Roman Pontiff is found during the time of St. Gregoiy in book 10, letter 31, and therefore before the year of the Lord 606, for Gregory was not living at that time.

On the priestly anointing we have the testimony of Gregory Nazianzen, who lived about the year 380. He said in his Apology for his father, when he was made the bishop of the Sasima: *Again the anointing and the spirit came upon me; and again I go forward weeping and sad.* In this place he mentions a twofold anointing—one whereby he was

anointed previously when he was ordained a priest, and the second whereby he was anointed in his consecration as a bishop. Likewise, in Oration 1 on peace, when speaking about Basil who, having been created a bishop, refused the province: *When he had received the spirit, and had received in commission the business of the talents and the care of the flock, he was anointed with the oil of the priesthood and of perfection, but still because of his wisdom he hesitated to assume the leadership.*

Now concerning the sacrifice for the dead, the testimony of Augustine in this place will be sufficient; in chapter 53 of his book on the heresies he says that it was a fundamental dogma of the heresiarch Arius that it is not necessary to make offerings for the dead.

Concerning reverence for images the testimony of Jerome, who lived about the year 400, will be sufficient for us. He said on the life of Paul: *Prostrate before the cross, as if he saw the Lord hanging there, he adored.* Finally, on the adoration of the Eucharist St. Ambrose should deservedly suffice; in book 3, chapter 12 on the Holy Spirit, while explaining the words "worship at his footstool," said: *Therefore, by his footstool the earth is understood; by the earth, the flesh of Christ, which today also we adore in the mysteries, and which the apostles adore in the Lord Jesus, as we said above.* Augustine says almost the same thing in his explanation of Psalm 99.

Therefore, since all those things, which the adversaries say are marks of the Antichrisζ were in use in the Catholic Church for many years before the birth of the Antichrist, it is necessary either that the Antichrist learned them from the Church—and to say this is to confuse the Antichrist with Christ, or none of them pertain to the marks of the Antichrist. And this is what we contend. But these points will suffice for that temerarious and absurd opinion of the adversaries, which they have tried to prove with no witnesses and no reasons.

Another opinion is that of some Catholics, who think that the mark of the Antichrist is certain letters, by which the name of Antichrist will be written. Thus Primasius, Bede and Rupert, who seem to be deceived because they read: *Unless he has the mark of the name of the beast, or the number of his name.* But John does not say it that way, but in this way: *Unless he has the mark, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name.* And the Greek text agrees with this: εί μη ό έχων το χάραγμα, ή το όνομα του θηρίου, ή τον άριθμον του όνοματος αύτου.

The third opinion is that of Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world, and of some others, who say that the mark of the beast will be not to use the sign of the cross, but rather to execrate and abolish it; in this matter the Calvinists excellently precede the Antichrist. I believe also that a positive mark will be invented by the Antickn^ just as Christ has the sign of the cross known by all, but that it will not be known what that mark is until the Antichrist actually comes, as we said also about his name.

CHAPTER XII

ON THE GENERATION OF ANTICHRIST

With regard to the fifth question, on the generation of the Antichrist, there are some things clearly erroneous that are asserted by some, certain things that are probable, and some that are established and certain. First of all, therefore, concerning the Antichrist formerly there were several errors. First, that the Antichrist would be born of a virgin by the work of the devil, just as Christ was born of the virgin by the work of the Holy Spirit.

The author of the small book on the Antichrist recounts this error, which is placed under the name of Augustine at the end of volume IX. This small book is probably the work of Rabanus; certainly it cannot be from Augustine. The error is obvious, because to produce a man without the seed of a man is something only God can do, who can supply all the efficient causes, because he alone has infinite power and contains within himself virtually all the perfection of creatures. But the devil, who is a creature, can surely do marvelous things by applying swiftly action to passive things; but he cannot supply the active powers of causes. Therefore, St. Augustine in letter 3 to Volusianus says that to be born of a virgin was a miracle of such magnitude in Christ that a greater one cannot be expected from God.

However, it would not be an error if someone says that Antichrist will be born from the devil and a woman in the way in which some are said to be born of incubus demons. For, although the devil per se without the semen of a man cannot produce a man, still in the body assumed in the form of a woman he can very well perform the carnal act with a man, and receive the seed, and then the same demon in the form of a man he can perform a similar act with a women, and inject the seed received from the man into the womb of a woman, and in this way generate a man. Augustine bears witness to this in book 15, chapter 23 of *The City of God* and then he adds that this has been proved by experience to such an extent that it seem to be impudent to want to deny it.

The second error was that of the blessed martyr Hippolytus who, in his Oration on the end of the world, teaches that Antichrist is the devil himself, who from a false virgin assumes false flesh. For, as the Word of God, which is the truth itself, assumed true flesh from a true virgin, so Hippolytus thought it probable that the devil, who is the father of lies, would simulate taking human flesh from a virgin. This opinion is refuted both because in 2 Thess. 2 Antichrist is called a man, and also because other Fathers write with common consensus that Antichrist will be a true man.

The third error is that Antichrist will indeed be a true man, but at the same time also a devil, by the incarnation of the devil, as Christ by the incarnation is God and man. This error is mentioned and refuted by Jerome in his comments on Dan. 7, by Bede on Rev. 13, and by Damascene in book 4, chapter 27.

Origen believed that this opinion is possible, because in volume 5 on John he said that some angels have been incarnated; Jerome refutes this in the preface to Malachi and in his comments on Haggai 1. And doubtless it is erroneous, because a created person, who therefore is finite, cannot sustain two perfect natures, as the Word of God can,

because he is infinite. And among theologians there is now no controversy on this matter; for, although some say that it surely implies a contradiction, but others say that it does not, nevertheless all agree that it cannot be done by the powers of a creature alone and that is what the devil is.

The fourth error is that Nero will resurrect and will be Antichrist, or certainly that he still lives and is preserved secretly in the vigor of his young age, and will appear in his own time. Sulpitius suggests this error in book 2 of his sacred history, but in book 2 of the dialogue on virtue of St. Martin he writes clearly that it is not Nero himself who will be Antichrist, but that he will come with Antichrist, and finally be killed by Antichrist. However, since all these things are said without any good reason, deservedly St. Augustine in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God* calls this opinion a mere presumption.

Besides these errors there are two probable opinions of the holy Fathers concerning the generation of Antichrist.

The first is that Antichrist will be born of a fornicating woman, not from a legitimate marriage. Damascene teaches this in book 4, chapter 27, and also some others, but since it cannot be shown from Scripture, it is indeed probable but not certain.

The second opinion is that Antichrist will be born from the tribe of Dan. This is asserted by Irenaeus in book 5, Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world, Ambrose in chapter 7 in the book on blessed patriarch, Augustine in question 22 on Joshua, Prosper in part 4 on the promises and predictions of God, Theodoretus in question 109 on Genesis, Gregory in book 31, chapter 10 on Morality, Bede, Rupert, Arethas, Richard and Anselm in their comments on Rev. 7. They prove this from Gen. 49:17: *Dan shall be a serpent in the way, a viper by the path, etc.* Likewise from Jer. 8:16: *The snorting of their horses is heard from Dan, etc.* Finally, from what is found in Rev. 7, where it is said that twelve thousand are sealed from every tribe of the sons of Israel, the tribe of Dan is omitted; this seems to be done in hatred of Antichrist.

This opinion is very probable because of the authority of so many Fathers, but still it is not absolutely certain, both because many of those Fathers do not say that they know this, but they suggest that it is probable, and because not one of those Scripture texts is convincing. For, first of all, in Gen. 49:17 Jacob seems to speak literally about Samson when he says: *Dan shall be a serpent in the way, a viper by the path, that bites the horse's heels so that his rider falls backwards.* For, Samson was from the tribe of Dan, and for the Philistines he was like a serpent in the way; for he encountered them everywhere and he harassed them. Jerome explains it in this way in his Hebrew questions. And surely Jacob seems to invoke a blessing on his son, when he says this, and therefore he is predicting not evil, but goodness.

But if that is accommodated to Antichrist allegorically, only a probable argument can be drawn from it, such as is drawn from the mystical senses. But Jeremiah in chapter 8 without doubt is not speaking about Antichrist, nor about the tribe of Dan, but about Nebuchadnezzar; it was he who was going to come to destroy Jerusalem, through the region which was called Dan, as Jerome there rightly explains it. But why Dan is omitted in Rev. 7 is not a sufficient reason, especially since Ephraim is also omitted, and it was one of the most important tribes.

Besides these two probable opinions, there are another two certain ones. One, that Antichrist will come especially because of the Jews, and that he is to be received by them as the Messiah; the other, that he will be bom from the nation of the Jews, and will be circumcised, and will observe the Sabbath, at least for some time. That first idea is taken from John 5:43, where the Lord says to the Jews: *I have come in my Father's name, and you do not receive me; if another comes in his own name, him you will receive.* We demonstrated above in chapter 2 that this text must refer to Antichrist from the Apostle in 2 Thess. 2:10-11 : *They refused to love the truth, and so be saved. Therefore God sends upon them a strong delusion, to make them believe what is false, etc.* Calvin and the other heretics in their commentaries on these words, explain this text as applying to us, who, because we do not receive their gospel, are allowed to be seduced by the Roman Antichrist. But they do not supply any testimonies for this, but we have for our position all the interpreters, who explain it as applying to the Jews. See Ambrose, Chrysostom, Theodoretus, Theophylact, Oecumenius

Besides these, Jerome says in question 11 to Algasia: *Antichrist will do all of these things, not with the power, but with the permission of God on account of the Jews, and because they refused to accept the charity of truth, that is, the Spirit of God through Christ that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, that is, the fount of error, to believe the lying, etc.* And even without the commentaries of so many Fathers the matter itself cries out that the Apostle is speaking about the Jews. For he himself says that Antichrist is to be sent to those who refused to receive him. But who are those who had a greater obligation, and did not want to accept Christ, than the Jews? There also it is to be noted that the Apostle did not say that they will not accept the truth, but that they did not accept it. Therefore he is talking about those who refused to believe, when Christ and the Apostles were preaching. And it is certain that at the time of the Apostles the Gentiles were very eager to accept the Gospel, but that the Jews refused to accept it.

On this matter, besides Jerome and the others already cited, all the other Fathers teach the same thing, like Irenaeus in book 5, Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world, Theodoretus in his letter on the divine decrees and in the chapter on Antichrist, Sulpitius from St. Martin in book 2 of the Dialogues, Cyril in Catechism 15, Hilary in canon 25 on Matthew, Ambrose in book 10, chapter 21 on Luke, Chrysostom, Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria in comments on John 5, Gregory in book 31, chapter 10 in his Morality, Damascene in book 4, chapter 27. And reason also recommends the same thing.

For Antichrist doubtless will first of all join himself with those who are ready to receive him; but the Jews are of that mind, since they are expecting a Messiah as a temporal king, which is what Antichrist will be. The Gentiles expect no one; but Christians of course are expecting Antichrist, but with fear and dread, not with joy and hopefulness. Therefore, as Christ came first to the Jews, to whom he had been promised, and by whom he was expected, and then he joined to himself also the Gentiles, so also Antichrist will come to the Jews first, by whom he is expected, and then gradually he will subject all the Gentiles to himself.

Indeed that Antichrist will be a Jew, and circumcised, is certain, and is deduced first of all from what has been said. For, Jews would never accept a non-Jewish man, or someone uncircumcised as their Messiah. Another reason is that the Jews are expecting a Messiah from the family of David, and from the tribe of Judah. Without doubt although Antichrist truly is from the tribe of Dan, he will claim and pretend to be from the family of David. Then all the old authors clearly teach that Antichrist will be a Jew, like the twelve authors just cited above, who say he will be from the tribe of Dan. Moreover, the following say he will be a Jes: Ambrose, who on 2 Thess. 2 says he will be circumcised, and Jerome, who on Dan. 11 says he will be bom of the people of the Jews, and St. Martin in Sulpitius on book 2 of the Dialogues, who says that Antichrist will command that all be circumcised according to the law, and Cyril, who says in Catechism 15 that he will be very zealous for the temple in Jerusalem in order to show that he is from the race of David; finally, also Gregory, who in book 11 in letter 3 says that Antichrist will be a promoter of the Sabbath observance and of other Jewish ceremonies.

From all of this we have an evident demonstration that the Pope is not Antichrist. For, since the year 606, when the adversaries say the Antichrist came, it is certain that there has been no Jewish Pontiff, not by family, not by religion, not in any way. Also it is certain that until now the pontiff has never been accepted by Jews as the Messiah, bu on the contrary he has been considered especially to be an enemy and persecutor. Henc<j in their daily prayers they pray to God that he will give to the living Pontiff a good mind towards the Jews, and that in his days he will send the Messiah, who fill free them from the power of the Pontiff, and of the bishops. First of all they call the Sovereign Pontiff ĪIZHII which in Aramaic means *tail,* and it is opposed to the head. The reason for this is that we call the bishop the head of the people; they, on the contrary, call him the tail out of contempt. Therefore it is absolutely out of the question that they are ready to accept the Sovereign Pontiff as the Messiah.

Finally, Rabbi Levi Gerson in his comments on Dan. 7 and 10, and concerning everything said about Antichrist, explains all of it to be about the Roman Pontiff, whom he also calls another Pharaoh, and contrasts him to the coming Messiah. See the Oration of Mahafor, fol. 26.

CHAPTER XIII

ON THE THRONE OF ANTICHRIST

Regarding the sixth question, the adversaries boldly affirm that the principal seat of Antichrist is Rome, or the apostolic chair located in Rome. For they say that Antichrist is going to occupy the chair of Peter and raise it to the highest dignity, so that from there he can preside over the whole Church and tyrannically dominate it. And that Rome is the royal city of Antichrist they prove from Rev. 17 where John, when speaking about the throne of Antichrist, says that it is a great city which is seated upon seven hills, and which has dominion over the kings of the earth.

However, that Antichrist is going to have his throne in Rome, not in the palace of Nero but in the Church of Christ, they prove from Paul, who in 2 Thess. 2:4 says that Antichrist *will take his seat in the temple of God.* For, since he says absolutely *in the temple of God,* he understands the true temple of the true God; but there is no such temple except the Church. For, the temples of the Gentiles are true temples, but of demons not of God; the temple of the Jews was indeed the temple of God, but he had already departed from that temple, when the sacrifice and Jewish priesthood ceased to exist. For, these three things are so joined together that one cannot exist without the others. Moreover, that temple of the Jews shortly thereafter was destroyed, and it will never be rebuilt, according to what Daniel says in chapter 9:27: *And the desolation will continue until the consummation and end;* therefore the Apostle cannot be speaking about it.

And this argument is confirmed by the Fathers. Jerome in question 11 to Algasia said: *He will be seated in the temple of God, either in Jerusalem, as some think, or in the Church, which we think is more likely.* And Oecumenius said: *he does not say the temple of Jerusalem, but the Churches of Christ.*

Theodore Bibliander adds the testimony of Gregory, who said in book 4, letter 38 to John of Constantinople: *The king of pride is near, and what is sinful to say, an army of priests is waiting for him.* From these words a twofold argument is taken. One goes like this: John of Constantinople is said to precede Antichrist, because he wants to be called the universal bishop; therefore he will be Antichrist, who will really make himself the universal bishop, and he will be seated in the Church as the head of all. Here is the second argument: Priests will be the army of Antichrist; therefore Antichrist will be the prince of priests. From these things the heretics think that they can show clearly that the Roman Pontiff is Antichrist, since he rules in Rome, he is seated in the temple of God, he is called the universal bishop, and he is the prince of priests.

Nevertheless the opinion is true that the throne of Antichrist will be in Jerusalem, not in Rome, and the temple is that of Solomon and of David alone, not the temple of St. Peter or the apostolic See. We can give two proofs for this: first, by an *ad hominem* argument, and then from the Scriptures and the Fathers.

First of all, therefore, I will present this argument. Antichrist will sit in the Church of Christ, he will be considered its leader and head, and in it he will oversee teaching and administration, as is taught by Philip Melanchthon in the Apology, article 6, on the

Augustine Confession, Calvin in book 4, chapter 2 § 12 and chapter 7 § 25 in his Institutes, Illyricus in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435, and all the other contemporary sectarians: and the Roman Pope is Antichrist, as these men teach in the same places. Therefore the Roman Pope is seated in the true Church of Christ, and he is the leader and head of his Church. But the Church of Christ can be only one, just as Christ is one, as Calvin also teaches in book 4, chapter 1 § 2 of his Institutes. Therefore, Lutherans and Calvinists, and all those separated from the Church which is under the Pope, are outside the true Church of Christ.

Calvin saw this argument and responded that under the Pope not so much the Church, but the ruins of the Church of Christ are perceived. For he speaks in this way in book 4, chapter 2 § 11 of the Institutes: *Just as formerly among the Jews some special prerogatives of the Church remained, so today we do not take away from the papists the traces of the Church which the Lord wanted to survive among them after the dissolution.* And after that: *By his providence God brought it about that some other remains would survive, lest the Church completely disappear. And as often buildings are torn down in such a way that the foundations and ruins remain, so he has not allowed his Church to be fundamentally destroyed or abolished by Antichrist, and he wanted the building to remain half-standing after the devastation.* And after that in § 12: *Therefore it is clear and we do not deny that under his tyranny some Churches also remain.*

But this answer provides us with two arguments. First. If only ruins of the Church survive, then the Church of Christ has been destroyed; therefore the Truth itself has lied, since he said in Matt. 16:18: *And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* Second. The Church is ruined, and the Papists are in control of her ruins and foundation, and also the half-demolished building. Therefore, Lutherans and Calvinists have no Church; for they do not have the whole Church of Christ, for it is already destroyed, and the ruins are still in existence; but they also do not have the half-destroyed Church, for it is controlled by the Papists under Antichrist. Therefore, what do they have? Perhaps a new building; but by the very fact that it is new it cannot belong to Christ. But who cannot see, unless he is totally blind, that it is safer to be in the true Church of Christ, although it is half-ruined, and to remain there, rather than it is to be in no Church?

Now I come to the Scriptures by which it is proved that the seat of Antichrist will be in Jerusalem, not Rome. The first proof is Rev. 11:8 where John says that Enoch and Elijah will fight with Antichrist in Jerusalem, and that they will be killed there by the same Antichrist: *And their dead bodies,* he said, *will lie in the street of the great city which is allegorically called Sodom and Egypt, where their Lord was crucified.* On this text Arethas said: *He will throw their unburied corpses into the streets of Jerusalem. For he will reign in it as the king of the Jews.* All the other interpreters explain it in the same way, and surely it cannot be denied in any way that these things are said about Jerusalem. For, which is the city, were the Lord was crucified, unless it is Jerusalem?

Therefore Chytraeus, who wants this city to be Rome, omits the words, *where their Lord was crucified,* as if they did not pertain to this matter, or because he did not read them. And there is no problem in the fact that Jerome in letter 17 to Marcella tries to show that Jerusalem cannot be called Sodom, because passim in Scripture it is called the holy

city. For, in that letter he urges Marcella to leave Rome and to come to Palestine, and so she will learn everything she can in praise of Jerusalem, and reprehension of Rome, and he tries in every way to make excuses for Jerusalem. And he does not do this in his own name, but in the name of Paula and Eustochium, whom he thought should be forgiven, if they described things somewhat differently than they really are. For, that the land of Jerusalem could be said to be Sodom because of the licentiousness and shameful crimes of the Jews is clear from Isa. 1:1 when he writes the title: *The vision of Isaiah, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem,* and briefly thereafter he adds: *Hear the word of the Lord, you rulers of Sodom! Give ear to the teaching of our God, you people of Gomorrah!*

Now this argument is not valid: Jerusalem is said to be holy, and therefore it cannot be called Sodom. For, as the same Jerome says in the same letter: Rome is called Babylon by John, and a purple-clad prostitute because of the pagan Emperors; nevertheless the same city is holy because of the Church of Christ and the tombs of Peter and Paul. So also Jerusalem is a holy city because of the prophets and apostles, who preached there, because of the cross of Christ and his tomb and similar things; however, it is also Sodom and Egypt because of the shameful crimes and blindness of the unbelieving Jews.

The second text is Rev. 17 where John says that the ten kings, who divide the Roman Empire among themselves, and to whom during their rule Antichrist will come, will hate the purple-clad harlot, that is Rome, and they will make it desolate and also burned up by fire. Therefore how will it be the throne of Antichrist, if at that time it must be destroyed and burned?

There is also this, as we demonstrated above, namely, Antichrist will be Jewish, both the Messiah of the Jews and king; therefore doubtless he will establish his throne in Jerusalem, and he will attempt to restore the temple of Solomon. For the Jews dream about nothing else but Jerusalem and the temple; and it seems that they will never accept someone as the Messiah, if he does not have his seat in Jerusalem and in some way restore the temple. Therefore, Lactantius says in book 7, chapter 15 that there will be a great kingdom in Asia during the time of Antichrist, that the West will serve him, and that he will rule the East. In chapter 17 he designates the part of Asia, in which this kingdom will be, and he says it is Syria, that is Judea, which is a part of Syria, and which by the Latins is always called Syria. Likewise Jerome and Theodoretus, in comments on Dan. 11, conclude that Antichrist will establish his tents in the region of Jerusalem, and finally will be killed on the Mount of Olives. And Irenaeus in book 5 says clearly that Antichrist will rule in the land of Jerusalem.

The third text is in these words of Paul: *So that he takes his seat in the temple of God* (2 Thess. 2:4). For, although various explanations are given by the Fathers, and some understand the minds of the faithful for the temple of God, in which Antichrist is said to sit, after he has seduced them, as Anselm explains it; still some understand by the temple Antichrist himself, with all of his people. For the Antichrist wants himself and his own to seem to be the true spiritual temple of God, that is, the true Church, as Augustine explains in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God.* There he deduces this explanation from the way of speaking of Paul, who did not say in Greek ἐν τω ναω, *in the temple,* but

εἰς τον ναόν, *in the temple,* as if he were to say, Antichrist will take his seat in the temple of God, that is, as if he with his own will be the temple of God. However, that note of Augustine is not necessary, for although in Latin it is not correct to say *"in templum"* for *"in templo"* still in Greek it is not wrong to say καθέζομαι είς την Εκκλησίαν, or είς τον ναόν; actually, that is the way it is usually expressed.

Some authors also understand it as the Churches of Christians, which Antichrist will order to be put at his disposal, as Chrysostom interprets it; but the more common, more probable and more literal explanation is that of those who say that by the temple of God here is understood the temple of Solomon, in which Antichrist will be seated, no matter what stage of repair it may be in. For, first of all, in the Scripture of the New Testament the Churches of Christians are never understood as the temple of God, but always the words refer to the Jerusalem temple; and what is even more significanL the ancient Latin and Greek Fathers for several centuries never called Christian Churches temples, which in Greek are called ναοί, as Paul says in this place, but they call them ευκτήρια, that is, *oratories,* as Churches, or houses of prayer, or basilicas, or graves of martyrs.

Certainly neither Justin, nor Irenaeus, nor Tertullian, nor Cyprian use the name "temple" when they speak about the Churches of Christians; also, Jerome in his letter to Riparius says Julian the Apostate ordered that the basilicas of the saints should be either destroyed or converted into temples.

However, there are two reasons why the apostles do not call the Christian Churches temples. One is because then they did not have any temples, but only certain rooms in private homes set aside for prayer, lectures, and the holy celebrations of Masses. The second reason is because the memory of the Jewish temple was still very strong, and the apostles did not want to introduce anything similar, and in order to distinguish the Church from the synagogue they avoided the word "temple." Just as also for the same reason the apostles in the Scriptures never call Christian priests "priests," but only bishops and elders. But after Jerusalem was destroyed, and the temple burned down, and the memory of the old temple and the priesthood was lost, passim the holy doctors began to use the names temple and priesthood.

Certainly, therefore, the Apostle, when writing that Antichrist would be seated in the temple of God, was saying something that he wanted to be understood by those to whom he was writing, and they at that time would not understand by the name of the temple anything but the temple in Jerusalem; so it seems certain that the Apostle was talking about that. This is also confirmed by the usual explanation of the Fathers. Irenaeus in book 5 said: *When Antichrist is seated in the temple in Jerusalem, then the Lord will come, etc.* Hippolytus the martyr in the Oration on the end of the world said: *He will build a temple in Jerusalem.* The same thing is taught by St. Martin in Sulpitius in book 2 of the Dialogues. Cyril of Jerusalem said in his Catechism 15: *The Apostle is speaking about such a temple, namely, the temple of the Jews that remains. God forbid that it take place in the Church in which we are.* And Hilary in canon 25 on Matthew said: *The Antichrist accepted by the Jews will live in the place of sanctification.* There he is clearly speaking about the temple of the Jews; for, he calls it the place of sanctification, which is what Christ calls the holy place in Matt. 24:15 when he says: *When you see the desolating*

sacrilege standing in the holy place.

Ambrose in his comments on Luke 21 says that Antichrist, according to history, will be seated in that temple into which the Romans threw the head of a pig, at the time of the Emperor Titus; however according to the mystical sense it means that he will be seated in the interior temple of the Jews, that is, in their faithless minds.

Sedutius in comments on this text of the Apostle gives this explanation for "in the temple of God": *He will attempt to rebuild the temple of Jerusalem, etc.* Damascene in book 4, chapter 27 said: *Not in our temple, but in the old Jewish temple.* Chrysostom, Theodoretus and Theophylact, who say Antichrist will be seated in the Churches of Christians, say that he will also sit in the temple of Solomon. For, Chrysostom says about this place: *He will order himself to be worshipped as God, and to be located in the temple, not only in Jerusalem but also in our Churches.* Theophylact and Theodoretus say the same thing; Augustine also in book 20, chapter 19 of *The City of God* and Jerome in question 11 for Algasia do not deny that Antichrist will be seated in the temple of Solomon.

Oecumenius is the only one who denies that Antichrist will sit in the temple of the Jews; but he is the most recent of all, and in no way is to be preferred to all the Fathers. Also, perhaps his text has been corrupted, and one part is missing; for it is not credible that he now wants to disagree with Chrysostom, Theodoretus and Theophylact, whom elsewhere he always follows.

Now we will respond to the arguments of the adversaries mentioned above. To the first one I respond in three ways. First, it can be said with Augustine on Ps. 27, Aretha, Haymo, Bede and Rupert that in Rev. 17 Rome is not to be understood by the haΓloζ who is seated on the seven hills and has dominion over the kings of the earth, but the entire city of the devil, which in Scripture often is called Babylon and is opposed to the city of God, that is, to the Church, which is called Jerusalem. But by the seven hills is to be understood the world of the proud, and especially of the kings of the earth, etc.

Secondly, it can be said, and in my opinion better, that by the harlot Rome is to be understood, as Tertullian explains in his book against the Jews and in book 3 against Marcion, and by Jerome in letter 17 to Marcella and question 11 to Algasia; it is the pagan Rome, which worships idols and persecutes Christians, but not the Christian Rome; this is how the same authors explain it.

And surely the impudence of the heretics is astonishing, since they try to prove that the Roman Church is the harlot arrayed in purple and for this they use the testimony of Tertullian and Jerome. For, since at that time pagan Rome was opposed to Christian Rome, which one, I ask, are those Fathers calling the harlot arrayed in purple? If it is pagan Rome, then why do the heretics abuse their testimony? If it is Christina Rome, then the Roman Church at that time had already degenerated, and Antichrist was reigning then; but not even they are willing to concede that. Furthermore, if Christian Rome at that time was Babylon, why does Tertullian say in his book on prescription: *Happy Church, on whom the apostles with their own blood poured forth the whole teaching!* And why does Jerome say in book 2 against Jovinian, speaking outside Rome: *I am speaking to you, who by your confession of Christ have erased the blasphemy written on your forehead!*

Finally, the same thing is evident from John himself, who says he is speaking about that Rome which had dominion over the kings of the earth, and which was drunk from the blood of the saints and from the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. These things certainly did not take place except in the Rome which, under the rule of Nero and Domitian, was slaughtering the martyrs.

Thirdly I say: even if that woman were Christian Rome, as the heretics say, still it would not give any strength to their argument. For, as we showed above, Antichrist will hate Rome, no matter how it is understood, and he will fight with it, and destroy it and burn it; from this it clearly follows that Rome will not be the seat or throne of Antichrist.

To the second point, we have already said that Paul there is talking about the temple of Solomon. Then to the reason we gave I respond that, when the sacrifices and Jewish priesthood ceased to exist, that temple also ceased to be the Jewish temple, but it did not immediately cease to be the temple of Christians, and really it was as long as it remained. For the apostles preached in it, and they prayed there after Christ's Ascension and the coming of the Holy Spirit, as is evident from the words in Luke 24:53: *They were continually in the temple praising and blessing the Lord.* Likewise in Acts 3:1 : *Now Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour.* And in Acts 5:20 the angel says to the apostles: *Go and stand in the temple and speak to the people all the words of this life.*

To the quote from Daniel I respond either that Daniel wanted to say that the temple will not be rebuilt until the end of the world, which is true, because Antichrist will come before the end of the world; or that the desolation will remain forever, because even if it were to be rebuilt, still it will never be a temple that is not profaned after the destruction wrought by Titus. For when it is rebuilt by Antichrist, then especially the abomination of desolation will remain in it, that is, Antichrist himself or his image; or finally, the temple will never be perfectly rebuilt, but the construction will just be started, and Antichrist will be seated in that temple in its beginning stages.

To the quotes from the Fathers we now respond that they either assert or at least do not deny that Antichrist will be seated in the temple of Solomon. But that many of them add that Antichrist will also sit in the Churches of Christians, is true, and it is not contrary to us; for the Fathers do not want to say that Antichrist will sit in the Church as bishop, as the heretics imagine, but that he will sit there as God. For, Antichrist will order that all the temples of the whole world be converted into worship of himself, and he will see himself worshipped in them. *He will command* (Chrysostom said in this place) that he be worshipped as God, and venerated, and placed in the temple, not only in Jerusalem, but also in the Churches. Others speak in the same way.

To the arguments taken from the words of St. Gregory I respond that from his words the contrary is deduced for those things which the heretics gather. For, they argue like this: the bishop of Constantinople preceded Antichrist, because he made himself the universal bishop; therefore Antichrist will be a universal bishop, who will take possession of everything for himself. But the contrary is gathered: for, the precursor should not be on the same level with the one whom he precedes, but much less, although is some way similar to him, as appears in the relation between John the Baptist and Christ. Therefore,

if the precursor of Antichrist is the one who makes himself the universal bishop, then the true Antichrist will not do that but something greater, that is, he will exalt himself against every so-called god. Or if the true Antichrist will make himself the only universal bishop, then that John of Constantinople, who did this, was not the precursor of Antichrist, but he himself was the true Antichrist; but Gregory does not say this, nor do the adversaries. Therefore the meaning of Gregory's words is that, because Antichrist will be very proud, and the head of all the proud, so that he does not suffer any associates, then whoever acquires something for himself in an undue manner, precedes him, and such were the bishops of Constantinople, who, when in the beginning were only archbishops, first claimed for themselves the patriarchate and then the title of universal bishop.

Similarly, when Gregory says, *an army of priests is prepared for him,* he does not want to say that priests as priests belong to the army of Antichrist; for thus he would also be including himself in that army. But he is saying that proud priests are preparing an army for Antichrist; for, he is talking about the same John, and other priests like him, who are raised above others unjustly. Hence it does not follow that Antichrist will be the prince of priests, but that he will be the prince of the proud.

From this chapter 6 we have a strong argument that the Pope is not Antichrist, because his seat is not in Jerusalem, nor in the temple of Solomon; indeed it is certain that since the year 600 no Roman Pontiff has ever been in Jerusalem.

CHAPTER XIV

ON THE DOCTRINE OF ANTICHRIST

There is an intense controversy between us and the heretics on the doctrine of Antichrist. It is certain from Scripture, and with this the adversaries agree, that there will be four parts to the doctrine of Antichrist. For, first he will deny that Jesus is the Christ; and therefore he will oppose all the institutions of our Savior, like Baptism, Confirmation, etc., and he will teach that circumcision, Sabbath observance, and other ceremonies of the old Law have not ceased to be binding. 1 John 2:22: *Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist, he who denies the Father and the Son.* Then when he will have convinced others that our Savior is not the true Christ, he will claim that he is the true Christ promised in the Law and the Prophets. John 5:43: *If another comes in his own name, him you will receive,* that is, as the Messiah.

Thirdly, he will say that he is God and is to be worshipped as God: 2 Thess. 2:4: So *that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God.* Finally, he will say he is not only God, but also that he is the only God, and he will attack all other Gods, that is, both the true God and also the false god and all idols. 2 Thess. 2:4: *And he will exalt himself against every so-called god or object of worship.* And Dan. 11:37: *He shall give no heed to the God of his fathers; he shall not give heed to any other god, for he shall magnify himself above all.*

The adversaries agree with us that all these things in some way are true, and pertain to Antichrist. But the question is concerning the understanding of these four points. For, Catholics simply understand, as the words of Scripture say, that the Antichrist will deny the true Christ, that he will make himself Christ, that he will proclaim himself as God, and will curse all other Gods and idols. From these points four arguments are taken that the Pontiff is not Antichrist. For, it is certain that the Pontiff has not denied that Jesus is Christ, nor has he introduced circumcision, or the Sabbath in place of Baptism and the day of the Lord; similarly, it is certain that the Pontiff has not made himself the Christ or God, and it is very certain that he has not made himself the only God, since he openly worships Christ and the Trinity, and according to the adversaries, also worships idols, that is, images and dead saints.

But the adversaries interpret all these things in a very different way. For, they say first of all that Antichrist will not deny verbally and openly that Jesus is the Christ, and baptism and the other sacraments; but that he will deny them by his deeds, because under the appearance of Christianity and the Church he will corrupt the doctrine on the sacraments, on justification, etc. Calvin in book 4, chapter 7 § 25 said: *We infer that the tyranny of Antichrist is of such a nature that he does not abolish the name either of Christ or of the Church; but rather he abuses them under the pretext of Christ, and under the title of the Church like a ghost he conceals himself* The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435 said: *Thus it is certain that* (the kingdom of Antichrist) *will profess the doctrine of Christ, but will really deny his merit and office.* And after that: *John,* they said, *shows that Antichrist will deny that Christ came in the flesh, that is, that*

Christ in his flesh completely redeemed and saved us, but because of our good works he also conferred on us something for our salvation. Then they say that Antichrist will not make himself Christ or God by his words, but by his works, because he will occupy the place of Christ and of God in the Church, making himself head of all the faithful, which belongs to Christ alone. So the Magdeburgenses said this in the same place: *He will proclaim himself as God, as the one who is the vicar of Christ, and head of the Church, and he will be able to create and to abrogate the articles of faith.*

Then they say Antichrist will not reject idols, indeed that he will openly adore them, which they prove from Daniel, who in chapter 11, after he had said that Antichrist would rise up against all the Gods, then added this: *But he will venerate the God Moazim in his own place, and the God whom their fathers did not know, he will worship with gold and silver, and with precious stones, etc.* By the "Moazim" the heretics understand the decoration of temples, the Mass, statues, relics, and similar things. This is the way Illyricus in his book against the primacy and all the others speak.

But what the Apostle says in 2 Thess. 2:4, namely, that Antichrist will exalt himself against every so-called god or object of worship, they explain as being about the Roman Pontiff, who makes himself the vicar of Christ; and still he claims for himself more authority than Christ had. Illyricus tries to prove this in the catalogue of witnesses (for how they prove the other points I have not yet seen) on page 3, namely, because Christ in Matt. 24:24 declared that there is nothing else to show that one is God, indeed to raise oneself above God and his worship, but to come in the name of Christ. From this it follows that the Pope, who tries to sell himself as the vicar of Christ, is himself the real Antichrist. Likewise Christ subjected himself to Scripture, saying that what he did and suffered, he did and suffered so that the Scripture might be fulfilled. But the Pope said that he could dispense from what the Apostle and the gospels say, that he can make bad things good, and vice versa. This is a summary of the main part of the doctrine of the adversaries about Antichrist; the whole doctrine is based on Scripture alone through new glosses falsely explained. An indication of this is the fact that they do not cite in their favor even one interpreter or doctor of the Church.

Therefore, let us begin with the first point—that Antichrist will openly and explicitly deny that Jesus is the Christ; and therefore he will reject all of his sacraments as the inventions of a deceiver. This is proved first of all from the sayings of chapters 5 and 6. For, if Antichrist by nation and religion is Jewish, and is accepted by Jews as the Messiah, as we have shown above, certainly he will not preach our Christ, but he will openly attack him; for otherwise through Antichrist Jews would accept our Christ, which is veiy absurd. Moreover, since there cannot be two Christs, how will Antichrist be able to show himself to the Jews as the Christ, unless he teaches them that our Christ, who preceded him, was not the true Christ?

It is proved secondly from these words in 1 John 2:22: *Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? This is the antichrist.* For, all heretics who in someway deny that Jesus is the Christ are said to be Antichrists; therefore, the true Antichrist simply and in eveiy way will deny that Jesus is the Christ. And this is confirmed, because through the heretics the devil is said to effect the mystery of iniquity, because secretly

they deny Christ. But the coming of Antichrist is said to be a revelation, because he will deny Christ openly.

There is also the witness of the Fathers. Hilary in book 6 on the Trinity says that the devil through the Arians tried to convince men that Christ is not the natural Son of God, but an adopted Son. But through Antichrist he will try to convince men that Christ is not even the adopted Son, in order to extinguish completely the name of the true Christ. Hippolytus the martyr in his Oration on the end of the world says that the mark or sign of Antichrist will be that men are forced to say, "I deny Baptism, I deny the sign of the cross," and similar things. Augustine in book 20, chapter 8 of *The City of God,* asks whether, when Antichrist is raging, it is credible that some will be baptized? Then he responds by saying: *Indeed, they will be so strong, both the parents for their children who are to be baptized, and those who then for the first time are to be baptized, that they will conquer that strong one even though he is unbound.* There St. Augustine presupposes that Antichrist will not permit them to be baptized, and nevertheless that some devout parents will suffer anything rather than allow their children not to be baptized.

Jerome has this to say on Dan. 11: *The Antichrist has to arise from a small nation that is, from the people of the Jews, and he will be so humble and looked down upon that royal honor will not be given to him and he will obtain the leadership through deceit and fraud. And he will do this because he will present himself as the leader of the covenant, that is, of the Law and the Testament of God.* Here Jerome is teaching that Antichrist will acquire the kingdom among the Jews, because he will show himself to be a zealous defender of the Jewish law. Sedulius in his comments on 2 Thess. 2 says that Antichrist will restore all the Jewish ceremonies in order to banish the gospel of Christ. Gregory in book 11, letter 3 said: *Since Antichrist forces the people to become Jews, in order to revive the rite of the external law and to turn the perfidy of the Jews to his own advantage, he wants the Sabbath to be observed.*

Finally, during the time of Antichrist, because of the vehemence of the persecution, public ceremonies and divine sacrifices will cease, as we showed in chapter 3. Because of this it is evident that Antichrist will not pervert the teaching of Christ under the name of Christianity, as the heretics do. No, he will openly attack the name of Christ and the sacraments, and he will introduce the Jewish ceremonies. Now since the Pope does not do this, it is evident that he is not Antichrist.

Indeed, since Antichrist will say openly and by name that he is the Christ, not his minister or vicar, is clear first of all from the Lord's words in John 5:43: *If another comes in his own name, him you will receive.* Here the Lord seem deliberately to have added "in his own name," since he foresaw that Lutherans and Calvinists would say that Antichrist will not come in his own name, but in the name of our Christ, as if he were his vicar.

Moreover, the Fathers passim teach this. Irenaeus in book 5 said: *He will attempt to show himself as the Christ.* Ambrose on Luke 21 said: *From the Scriptures he will argue that he is the Christ.* Theodoretus on 2 Thess. 2 said: *He will call himself Christ.* Cyril in Catechism 15: *He will introduce,* he said, *a certain man falsely calling himself the Christ, and by this appellation of Christ he will deceive the Jews who are waiting for him to come.* In brief, all the Fathers, as we showed above, say that Antichrist will be accepted

by the Jews as the Messiah, and therefore he will openly and by name make himself the Messiah, that is, Christ. Therefore the Roman Pontiff, who does not do this, as has been noted, is not the Antichrist. For, because he says he is the Vicar of Christ, he is saying that he is not the Christ, but his minister.

But that Antichrist openly will call himself God and want to be worshipped as God, not only by usurping some of God's authority but also the very name of God, is proved first of all from the express words of the Apostle in 2 Thess. 2:4: *So that he takes his seat in the temple of God, proclaiming himself to be God.* There Paul not only says that Antichrist will sit in the temple; for, we also sit in the temple although we are not antichrists; but also he explain the way in which he will sit, that is, that he will sit there as God, for whom alone temples are really built. For, it is not said ὡς θεός, *as God,* but ότι έστι θεός, that is, *proclaiming himself to be God.* And all the old authors understood the text in this way.

Irenaeus in book 5 said: *He is an apostate and a thief, as if he wants to be adored as God.* Chrysostom on this place: *He will command,* he said, *that he be worshipped as God and to be placed in the temple.* And in homily 40 on John, while explaining this text, he said: *He will profess himself to be the God of all things.* And after that: *He will glorify himself as the greatest of all the Gods.* Ambrose on 2 Thess. 2 said: *He will claim that he is God himself, not the Son of God.* All explain it in the same way. From this we understand that the Roman Pontiff, who acknowledges himself to be not God, but the servant of God, is not the Antichrist.

Finally, that Antichrist will not endure any God, either true or false or any idol, is proved first of all from these words of Paul in 2 Thess. 2:4: *He exalts himself above every so-called God or object of worship.* Here it is to be noted that for that "object of worship" the Greek is σέβασμα, which the Magdeburgenses say means "worship," that is, *the act of worship,* not "object of worship." Therefore from that they try to prove that the Apostle does not want to say that Antichrist will not worship idols, but to pervert the worship of the true God by mutilating the sacraments or by adding various ceremonies to them. But certainly the word σέβασμα in the proper sense signifies not the act, but the object, that is, what is worshipped, like an altar, a shrine, an idol, etc. For, the idea of worship is expressed with σέβας, or θεοσέβεια, not σέβασμα. Hence the same Paul says in Acts 17:23: Διερχόμενος γαρ και άναθεωρων τα σεβάσματα ύμων έυρον και βωμόν, etc. *For as I passed along, and observed the object of your worship, I found an altar, etc.* There clearly Paul understands by σεβάσματα the things which are worshipped, like shrines, altars, idols. And in Wis. 15:17 we read: Κρείττων γαρ έστιν των σεβασμάτων αύτου, ών αύτος μεν έζησεν, έκεινα δε ούδεποτε. *For he is better than the objects he worships, since he has life, but they never have.* I do not know whether or not anyone will dare to distort this text, so that he may deny that by the word σεβασμάτων the idols themselves are meant, which have been made by human hands, and which seem to have life, but actually are not living.

Therefore all Greeks, and also Erasmus himself, on whom the heretics rely very much, both in the translation and in the notes say that σέβασμα should be translated as *an object of worship.* Then the words of Daniel in chapter 11:37 are very clear: *He Ml*

give no heed to the gods of his fathers... for he shall magnify himself above all. Jerome, when writing about this text, says that it cannot be understood to be about Antiochus, as Porphyiy said, because it is certain that Antiochus adored the gods of the Greeks, but it must be understood about Antichrist, who will worship no God.

Finally, there is the consensus of the Fathers. Irenaeus in book 5 said: *Indeed he will banish idols, to convince others that he is God, and he will exalt himself as the one idol.* Hippolytus in his sermon on the end of the world said: *Antichrist will not permit idolatry.* Cyril in his Catechism 15: *Antichrist,* he said, *will hate all idols.* Chrysostom in this place said: *He is exalted above everything that is called God or an object of worship. For he will not permit idolatry.* The same thing is taught in this place by Theophylact, Oecumenius, and Theodoretus, who also notes very well that the devil in an amazing way plays with and will play with the sons of perdition. For, in ancient times he convinced many to adore false gods and idols, and in that way he won over many; but at the time of Antichrist, because he will see that through the teaching of Christ idols have been banished from almost the whole world, and the multitude of false gods, he also will attack all idols and in this way he will still deceive many. From this it is evident that the Pontiff, who according to Catholics acknowledges God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and according to the heretics adores many idols, in no way can be said to be Antichrist.

But, they say, Daniel in chapter 11 says that the God Moazim will be worshipped by Antichrist with gold, and silver, and precious stones.

I respond in the first place: by the God Moazim, who is interpreted as the god of fortresses, that is, he is very strong, can be understood to be the Antichrist himself. Since the phrase "he will be worshipped" in Hebrew is not mnrw *he will worship,* but **OD**l *he will glorify,* as God says in Psalm 91:*1 will rescue him and honor him:* in Hebrew it is ΊΠΠ33Κ and certainly God does not honor men by subjecting himself to them, but by exalting them. Therefore, Antichrist will glorify himself, when he causes himself to be adored by all. Hence also the Septuagint translates it as δοξάσει, and Theodoretus explains it in this way: *He calls himself a strong and powerful God, for this is what Moazim means. For he will erect temples to himself, and he will adorn them with gold, silver and precious stones.*

Secondly, it can be said, and this pleases me more: Antichrist will be a magician and, like other magicians, secretly he will adore the devil himself, with whose help he will work wonders, and I think that for this God to be called Moazim is not the name of a God, but of a very fortified and secret place, in which there will be the principal treasures of Antichrist, and in which, as we said, he will adore the devil. For this follows in Daniel, and he will bring it about that he secures Moazim with a foreign God whom he knew. And truly ovp signifies both firmness and fortress. Lyranus explains it in this way. But that it must necessarily be said that Antichrist is the God Moazim, or if he is someone else, only in a hidden place, and secretly must be adored by all according to Antichrist, is a conclusion forced on us by the words themselves of Daniel, which otherwise would be in conflict with themselves. For if he does away with all the gods, how will he openly worship idols?

Now the two argument of Illyricus are very trifling. For, in the first argument Illyricus

errs three times. First, because he says that the words of Paul are explained by Christ, since Paul rather than the words of Christ must be explained. Then, because he says that in Matt. 24 to come in the name of Christ means the same thing as to be a vicar of Christ. For, the explanation of Christ himself is opposed to this. For, the Lord said: *Many will come in my name,* and immediately he gives an explanation of this: *saying, I am the Christ.* Therefore, to come in the name of Christ in that place is to usurp for oneself the name of Christ. Of old Simon Magus did this, according to Irenaeus in book 1, chapter 20, and in our day David Georcius did the same. And finally Antichrist will do the same; but the Pope, by the fact that he calls himself the vicar of Christ, does not make himself to be the Christ.

Thirdly Illyricus errs because he makes Christ into an inept interpreter of Paul. For, he does not rightly explain these words of Paul *he exalts himself above every so-called god,* through the words, *many will come in my name,* in the sense that "they will make themselves my vicars." For, the vicar of God is not above every god, but below every god, as the vicar of a king is below every king. And it cannot be thought or imagined how someone can claim that he is the vicar of some king, and also glory in the fact that he is above all kings. From this the blindness and impudence of the adversaries is apparent, who sometimes utter things that are opposed to commons sense.

Next we will consider the argument of Illyricus with which he tries to prove that the Pope has usurped an authority greater than what Christ has. I respond that the proposition and assumption of his argument contains two lies, and also that the consequence is not valid. First of all, it is false that Christ subjected himself to the Scriptures, since it is certain that he is the author of the Scriptures, and therefore he is above the Scriptures. But when we read that Christ did what he did that the Scriptures might be fulfilled, the "that" does not signify the cause, but the event, as Chrysostom and Augustine teach in the comments on John 12:38; for, Christ did not die because Isaiah wrote about his death, but Isaiah wrote about it because it was going to happen in the future.

Secondly, it is also false that the Pontiff ever said by word or deed that he can dispense contrary to the evangelist or apostle. For, although he can dispense in matters concerning the positive precepts of the apostles, still this is not contrary to the apostle, but according to the apostle, who doubtless knew the apostolic power, which he had and used in his time for the good of the Church, would also exist in his successors, by which they could moderate or change the same things, as it became necessary for the good of the Church. But in the gospels, that is, in the divine precepts, no Catholic ever said that the Pontiff can in any way dispense from them.

Finally, the consequence is also faulty. For, in the major premise Illyricus speaks about the subjection of Christ to the Scriptures, not regarding the precepts but regarding the prophecies; for, Illyricus knew that Christ had changed the Sabbath, and had abrogated the ceremonial law; but in the minor premise he speaks about the precepts, and so the argument has four terms, and hence no conclusion can be drawn. These arguments about the teaching of Antichrist will suffice for now.

CHAPTER XV

ON THE MIRACLES OF ANTICHRIST

Three things are contained in the Scriptures about the miracles of Antichris^ he will perform many miracles. Second, what kind of miracles they will be. Third three examples are given The Apostle teaches in 2 Thess. 2:9 that Antichrist w.ll perform miracles: *The coming of the lawless one by the activity* qf *atan* wi ew 24:24: *They and with pretended signs and wonders.* And the Lor in e g P › · "They *will show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray,* will show," he said, not "he will show," because^yA 12 fhis Morality will perform signs, so that, as St. Gregory*n ^32 ch^ even the torturers of the holy martyrs then, wd K nature of them jn Rev. 13:13: *It works great signs... in the alf power and wUh pretended* 2 Thess. 2:9 in one word, saying: *The coming* w *si^nd wonders.* by reason of all the causer-final.

Moreover, the mendacious signs will tak _ P tQ show that Antichrist efficient, material and formal. For, the end^of th ostom in this place teaches that is God and Messiah, which will be a pem>® θ *W Ambrose also on this place* the lies will be called miracles, because^toy tea be ω he God, just teaches that the purpose of the lies of Anticnrisr our Christ proved his divinity by his true cause. for> the principal efficient

NeXmÎe called slgnS f5°7he devil For, the Apostle says this: *His coming* cause will be the father of lies, that is, the dev · that Antichrist will be a *will be according to the activity of Satan*. And a frconception> notable magician; indeed they say to de ⁀" ^gh him. Cyril in Catechism 15, or at least from his infancy, and will period when he said Antichrist will be a magician^and P come from evil skills, indicates that his miracles are to be the father of lies. matter, because they will be imaginary

AI» many ofh.sl.es will te by He delusionary, as Cynl and Theodo'enm

» raiset up the dead and to cure the s«*3»« X restorations or cures. Because of this in Rev. . .. , . f n not Ad» in the sight of men, that is, only ; r >—« °f men· ‘‘* real and true, as Arethas said in this same place.

Finally, some of the miracles will be by reason of the form «llhoughby of the matter, because sometimes he will perform real things but they^w.ll not L® the power of all nature; and therefore formally they wUl not be m.raclea For am miracles are said to be only those that can be worked by Cod alone, that is, thosenhat ‘‘ Mt have natural causes, either hidden or manifest And therefore m the^sigM_ofm«b . also in the sight of demons and angels they are miracles. However, all of Ant.chnst s Oracles will have natural causes, but they will be hidden from men.

Three examples of Antichrist's miracles are mentioned in Rev. 13. One is that he will make fire come down from heaven; the second is that he will make the image of the beast speak; the third is that he will pretend to die and rise again, and because of this miracle especially almost all the world will admire him. Of these miracles the first two will be true by reason of the matter, not by reason of the form; but that is in no way true for the third one.

But the objection could be made to this that not all of the miracles can be attributed to Antichrist. For, John in that place introduces two beasts: one, which has ten heads, and one of his heads is seen to die and to rise again; the other smaller one, which makes fire come down from heaven, and makes the image speak. Therefore, if Antichrist is the first beast, the two miracles of fire and the image are not attributed to him; if he is the second beast, the miracle of resurrection cannot be attributed to him.

I respond that the first beast signifies either the Roman Empire or the multitude of the wicked, as we said above: but that one of its heads, that is, the principal head, which seemed to die and to resurrect, is Antichrist; for Antichrist will be the highest and final head of the wicked, and he is the final king who rules the Roman Empire, however without the name of the Roman Emperor. And this fictitious miracle of resurrection, also to be attributed completely to Antichrist, is taught by Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Richard, Rupert and Anselm in this place. Gregory also teaches it in book 11, letter 3, which is to be noted against Lyranus, who explains it as being about a certain son of Cosdroas the king of the Persians, whom he imagines was wounded in some battle, and still was not killed. For, there is no reputable history that says any such thing about the son of Cosdroas; also it cannot be suitable for the son of Cosdroas because of what follows in Revelation: *The whole world followed the beast with wonder.., saying, "Who is like the beast?"*

Then the second beast in the Apocalypse according to Rupert signifies the same Antichrist. For, the same Antichrist is expressed by the two beasts: through one, by reason of the royal power and tyranny whereby he rules men with violence; through the other, by reason of the magical arts by which he cunningly seduces men. But according to Richard, and Anselm, and others, the second beast signifies the preachers of Antichrist, who attempt to show with miracles that Antichrist is the true Messiah. Therefore, all of these miracles will be worked either by Antichrist or his ministers. Hence it follows that the Pontiff is not the Antichrist; for, no Pontiff ever pretended to die and resurrect, and neither he himself nor any of his ministers made fire come down from heaven, or made an image speak.

But the Magdeburgenses object in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 436 that many mendacious miracles have been worked by the Pontiffs: *Such are the visions of souls crying out from purgatory and asking that Masses be celebrated for them, and the cures of the sick, which happened to those worshipping statues or making vows to saints.*

I respond first of all: those are not miracles which John says Antichrist will perform; but to die, and to resurrect, to bring down fire from heaven, to give images the power of speaking; let them show that these things were done by a Pontiff, or by Pontiffs. Then those three kinds of miracles were common in the Church before the time in which

the adversaries say the Antichrist appeared. For, St. Gregory writes in book 4, chapter 40 of his Dialogues about the deacon Paschasius, who lived during the time of Pope Symmachus, about the year of the Lord 500, that a soul appeared to St. Germanus, the bishop of Capua, and asked the bishop to pray for him, so that he might be freed from the torments of purgatory. Certainly this miracle happened a hundred years before Antichrist appeared, according to the opinion of all the contemporary heretics. For, no one puts the coming of Antichrist until after the year 600 and the death of Gregory I. The same Gregory writes in the same book 4, chapter 55, about other apparitions of souls begging for Masses.

There is an example about miracles of healing because of the veneration of images in Eusebius in book 7, chapter 14 of his History. There he recounts that a bronze statue to the Savior was erected by a woman whom he had cured of a flow of blood; a certain plant was accustomed to grow before the statue, and when it grew up to the edge of the statue and touched it, it cured all kinds of maladies. So it is evident from this miracle that God willed to approve the cult of sacred images.

There are innumerable testimonies among the ancients about healings given by God to those who vowed something to the saints, but the outstanding example of this is found in Theodoretus, who in book 8 to the Greeks, which is about martyrdom, writes that during his time the temples of the martyrs were full of votive tablets and images of hands, feet, eyes, heads, and other parts of the human body by which the various gifts of healing were indicated, which individuals had received from the holy martyrs because of their vows to them.

CHAPTER XVI

ON THE KINGDOM AND BATTLES OF ANTICHRIST

About the kingdom and battles of Antichrist we read four things in Scripture. First, that Antichrist, coming from a humble background, will acquire the kingdom of the Jews by fraud and deceit. Second, that he will fight with three kings, namely, of Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia, and once he has overcome them he will occupy their kingdoms. Third, he will conquer another seven kings and in this way he will become the monarch of the whole world. Fourth, with a huge army he will persecute Christians throughout the whole world, and this will be the battle of Gog and Magog. Given all of these things, since none of them pertain to the Roman Pontiff, it follows manifestly that he can in no way be called Antichrist.

Daniel says this concerning the first point in 11:21: *In his place shall arise a contemptible person to whom royal majesty has not been given; he shall come in without warning and obtain the kingdom by flatteries.* Jerome writes about this place that, although these things are understood in some way to be about Antiochus Epiphanes, nevertheless they are to be filled much more perfectly in Antichrist, just as the things expressed in Ps. 72 about Solomon are indeed thought to be about Solomon, but they are fulfilled more perfectly in Christ. Accordingly in the same place Jerome, after he had explained that the text is about Antiochus, following Porphyry, added the following: *Our people interpret this better and more correctly in the sense that, at the end of the world, Antichrist will do these things. He will come from a small nation, that is, from the Jewish people, and he will be such a humble and contemptible person that royal honor will not be given to him, and he will obtain dominion by deceitfulness and treachery.* Jerome says there that this is the common explanation of Christians. Regarding his origins, Daniel in chapter 7 compares Antichrist with a small hom because of his simple and obscure beginning.

Certainly this first point in no way pertains to the Roman Pontiff. For, it would be necessary to say that the Roman Pontiff until the year 600 was a very obscure figure, and of no repute, and then suddenly and by fraud obtained a very high place; but this view is clearly false. For, as Augustine says in letter 162: *The primacy of the apostolic See always flourished in the Roman Church.* And Prosper in book 2, chapter 6 on the Vocation of the Gentiles said: *Through the primacy of the priesthood Rome became a more important center of religion than the royal seat of power.* And the Council of Chalcedon in the letter to Leo says that the apostolic rays of Rome shine forth and spread out from there to all and they communicate their goodness to others. Finally, the pagan author Ammianus Marcellinus also in book 27, when writing about the schism of Damasus and Ursicinus, says that he is not surprised if men contend with so much effort for the Roman Pontificate, since its power and dignity are so great.

On the second point the same Daniel says this in chapter 7:8ff.: *I considered the horns, and behold, there came up among them another horn, a little one, before which three of the first horns were plucked up by the roots.* And further on explaining: *As for the ten horns,* he said, *out of this kingdom ten kings shall arise, and another shall arise after*

them; he shall be different from the former ones, and shall put down three kings. And in chapter 11 explaining who these three kings are: *He shall stretch out his hand against the countries,* he said, *and the land of Egypt shall not escape. He shall become ruler of the treasures of gold and of silver, and all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall follow in his train.* When writing about this passage, and especially on chapter 7, Jerome said: *We can say what all the ecclesiastical authors have handed on, namely, that at the end of the world, when the kingdom of the Romans is destroyed, there will be ten kings who will divide up the Roman world among themselves, and the eleventh one to rise up will be a small king* (Antichrist) *who will conquer three of the ten kings, that is, of Egypt, of Africa, and of Ethiopia. After they are killed the other seven kings will also submit their necks to the victor.* The same thing is taught about the three kings killed by Antichrist by Irenaeus in book 5, Lactantius in book 7, chapter 16, and Theodoretus in his comments on Dan. 7 and 11.

This in a special way refutes the insanity of the adversaries, who say the Pontiff is Antichrist. So let them say, if they can, when the Roman Pontiff killed the kings of Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia and occupied their kingdoms. Theodore Bibliander in his Chronicle says that the Roman Pontiff, as a small horn, removed the first horn from the ten when Gregory II excommunicated the Emperor Leo, a Greek iconoclast, and forbade tribute to be given him from Italy, and gradually he took over his territory, that is, the exarchate of Ravenna. He says the second horn was removed when Pope Zechariah deposed Childericus, king of the Franks, and ordered that Pepin should replace him. Concerning the third horn, he does not say it clearly, but he seems to indicate that the third horn was removed when Gregory VII excommunicated and deposed the Emperor Hemy IV. Also, there is in existence a letter of the Emperor Frederick II written against the Pontiff in which he says that the three horns removed by Antichrist are the kingdoms of Italy, Germany and Sicily, which the Roman Pontiff especially forced to serve him.

But these charges are worthless. For, first of all, Daniel is not talking about Gaul or Germany, but about the kingdoms of Egypt, Libya and Ethiopia. Then, the Pope did not kill any of those kings. Antichrist, however, will kill those three kings, as Jerome says. Moreover, Antichrist will claim those kingdoms for himself, and he will not hand them over to others. Also, the Pontiff did not take the kingdom of Gaul for himself, but he handed it over to Pepin. And when the emperor was deposed, he ordered it to be given to another—he did not usurp the kingdom for himself. Similarly, when he deprived the Emperor Leo of the principality of Ravenna, he did not claim it for himself, but he turned it over to the kings of the Lombards. Later, however, when Pepin had defeated the Lombards, he deeded it to the Pontiff. Finally, if to depose princes is to remove horns, then there will not be three, but many more removed by Antichrist. For, it is certain that those deposed by the Pontiff were, besides the Greek Leo III and the Frankish Childericus, also Hemy IV by Gregory VII, Otto IV by Innocent III, Frederick II by Innocent IV, and all of these really lost their authority.

On the third horn we have the clear testimonies of the ancients. Lactantius in book 7 chapter 16 and Irenaeus in book 5 say that Antichrist, after he has killed three of the ten kings, immediately will conquer the remaining ones, and then he will be the chief of

all. Jerome on the words in Dan. 11:24, "he shall do what his fathers did not do," said: *None of the Jews without Antichrist ever ruled over the whole world.* Chrysostom on 2 Thess. 2 said that Antichrist will be the future monarch, and will succeed the Romans in the monarchy, as the Romans succeeded the Greeks, the Greeks the Persians, the Persians the Assyrians.

Finally, Cyril in Catechism 15 says that Antichrist will obtain the monarchy, which formerly was Roman. And this opinion of the Fathers is rather clearly deduced from Rev. 17:12 where we read: *And the ten horns that you saw are ten kings... these are of one mind and they will give over their power and authority to the beast.* But it is certain that this in no way pertains to the Roman Pontiff; for the Pontiff never was king of the whole world.

On the fourth horn John says in Rev. 20:7ff.: *And when the thousand years are ended, Satan will be loosed from his prison and will come out to deceive the nations which are at the four corners of the earth, that is, God and Magog, to gather them for battle; their number is like the sand of the sea. And they marched up over the broad earth and surrounded the camp of the saints and the beloved city; but fire came down from heaven and consumed them, and the devil who had deceived them was thrown into the lake of fire and brimstone where the beast and the false prophet were, and they will be tormented day and night for ever and ever.* The last persecution and its end are described with these words. Concerning this matter Augustine says the following in book 20, chapter 11 of *The City of God: For this persecution, occurring while the final judgment is imminent, shall be the last which shall be endured by the holy Church throughout the world, the whole city of Christ being assailed by the whole city of the devil, as each exists on earth.* Similar ideas are present in Ezek. 38 and 39, which will now be explained briefly because of the many errors going around about this matter.

CHAPTER XVII

ON GOG AND MAGOG

Therefore, the first opinion, or rather error, is that of the Jews who teach that Gog is Antichrist and Magog is the innumerable Scythian peoples who live in the Caspian Mountains. But they say that God will come, that is, Antichrist with Magog, that is, with an army of Scythians, at the same time when the Messiah will first appear in Jerusalem. Then a battle will be started in Palestine, and there will be such a great slaughter for the army of God that for seven years Jews will not have to cut wood from trees to build a fire, but they will bum spears, shields, and similar weapons, which are strewn everywhere with the corpses, and then there will be a golden age, etc.

Jerome mentions this opinion in his comments on Ezek. 38, and Peter Galatinus in book 5, chapter 12 against the Jews, and Rabbi David Khimi passim in his Commentary on the Psalms. But the Jews err in two ways.

First, because they think that the battle of Gog and Magog will take place during the first coming of Christ, confusing the first with the second; but the Scriptures openly teach that in his first coming Christ will come in humility, and be immolated like a meek lamb, as is clear from Isa. 53 and elsewhere. Secondly, because they think Antichrist will come being against them, and that they will fight with their own Messiah; but actually, the Antichrist will be their Messiah, and will fight for the Jews against the true Chriſζ who is our Savior.

A second opinion is that of Lactantius in book 7, chapters 24 to 26; he thinks the battle of Gog and Magog will take place one thousand years after the death of Antichrist. For he teaches that Antichrist will come six thousand years after the creation of the world, and that he will reign three years and a half; then after Antichrist is killed, Christ will appear, the resurrection will take place, and the saints will reign with Christ here on earth for a thousand years in great peace and tranquility; in the meantime unbelievers will exterminated, or at least will serve peacefully. At the end of this time the devil will be loosed again, and will stir up a fierce war among all the nations, which served the saints for a thousand years. That war will be against the same saints, and this is the war of Gog and Magog about which Ezekiel and Daniel are speaking. But shortly thereafter all the wicked will be killed by God, and then there will be a second resurrection and the world will be completely renewed.

This opinion was also adopted by many of the old authors, like Papias, Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Apollinaris, and some others, as Jerome says in his comments on Ezek. 36, and Eusebius in the last chapter of book 3 of his History. But this error was demolished a longtime ago as a certain error. For the Lord in Matt. 24 and 25 openly teaches that after the persecution of Antichrist the final judgment will take place immediately, and that all the good will enter into eternal life, and all the wicked into eternal fire. Therefore there will be no wars after the thousand years, or ever after that.

The third opinion is that of Eusebius who, in book 9, chapter 3 of his demonstration of the gospel, thinks that Gog is the Roman Emperor, and Magog is his empire. But this is based on a false foundation. For he deduces this opinion from Num. 24:7-8. For, there we read according to the Septuagint translation: *The kingdom of Gog will be exalted and*

his kingdom will increase; God led him out of Egypt, etc. There Scripture seems to say that when Christ will return from Egypt, during the time of his infancy, then the kingdom of Gog will be exalted; but it is certain that when Christ was an infant no kingdom was exalted except that of the Romans.

But without doubt the edition of the 70 translators in this place has been corrupted. For, in Hebrew, it is not Gog, but Agag, ID|?» XIKB 07η. And its king will be taken away because of Agag, or on account of Agag. And the meaning is, according to Jerome in his comments on Ezek. 38, that Saul, the first king of Israel, will be removed because of Agag, that is, because he sinned by not killing Agag. Or according to others, Saul will be removed because of Agag, that is, Agag will prevail over him and conquer him. Both are true. And it is certain that that place in Numbers is to be understood to be about the kingdom of the Jews, not about Christ or the Romans. For it begins: *How fair are your tents, O Jacob, your encampments, O Israel* (Num. 24:5).

The fourth opinion is that of those who by Gog and Magog understand the battles of the devil and his angels formerly waged in heaven with the good angels; Jerome in his comments on Ezek. 38 refutes this as destructive of the literal meaning.

The fifth opinion is that of Theodore Bibliander, whom Chytraeus follows in his Commentary on Rev. 20. Therefore, Bibliander in tab. 14 of his Chronicle accurately speaks about Gog and Magog, and then he teaches that the prophecy of Ezekiel and John does not pertain to the same time. So he says the prophecy of Ezekiel was fulfilled in the time of the Maccabees, and that Gog and Magog were Alexander the Great, and the kings following him in Syria and Egypt, who engaged the Jews in many battles, and finally were overcome by the Maccabees. He says that the prophecy of John was fulfilled during the time of Pope Gregoiy VII and of some of the Popes following him. He also says that Gog and Magog were the Pontiffs and other princes and armies of Christians, who fought for a long time against the Saracens for the Holy Land and in order to recover the tomb of the Lord.

The first part of this opinion is also that of Theodoretus concerning Ezek. 38, but it cannot be defended. First, because without doubt the prophecies of Ezekiel and John are one and the same; and therefore both are to be fulfilled after the coming of Christ. For, in the first place, John says that the army of Gog will come from the four comers of the earth, and Ezekiel says the same thing, namely, by explaining that in the army of Gog there will be Persians from the East, Ethiopians from the South, that is, Tubal, Spaniards from the West, that is Togorma, Phrygians from the North. Then John says: when fire comes down from heaven this army will be destroyed; and Ezekiel says the same thing at the end of chapter 38:*I will rain on him and his hordes,,, fire and brimstone.* Finally, John joins immediately to this battle the renewal of Jerusalem, that is, the glorification of the Church, and similarly Ezekiel from chapter 40 to the end of the book treats of nothing other than the wonderful renewal of Jerusalem.

Also, in the second place, it is proved that the prophecy of Ezekiel was not fulfilled during the time of the Maccabees. For, in Ezek. 38 it is said to Gog—you will come in the last years; but Alexander the Great with his army came in the middle of the years. Then Ezekiel says plainly that in Gog's army there will be Ethiopians, Libyans, Spaniards, Cappadocians, etc. But these people never fought against Jerusalem, and especially during

the time of the Maccabees; for, only Syrians and Egyptians fought against the Maccabees.

Finally, Ezekiel describes such a victory against Gog and Magog, that after that no enemies would have to be feared, but that this will be the end of all wars. But the victory of the Maccabees against the kings of Syria and Egypt was not like that; for the Jews never completely conquered the kings of Syria and Egypt, and shortly thereafter the Jews were attacked by the Romans and captured; and they never freed themselves from their hands, as Augustine concludes and proves in book 18, chapter 15 of *The City of God,* Therefore the prophecy of Ezekiel was not fulfilled before the time of Christ.

The second part of Bibliander's opinion, which is proper to him, is not only false but it is also impious. For, in the first place, John says that the battle of Gog and Magog will be against the camps of the saints and the beloved city, that is, against the true Church of God; but the war of Christians to recover the Holy Land was against Saracen Mohammedans, unless perhaps Bibliander wants the Mohammedans to be the true Church of God and the camp of the saints. Then John says that the men in the army of Gog will be from the four comers of the earth; but in the Christian army there were men only from the West and the North, that is, Gauls, Germans, Italians. Furthermore, John says, when the war with God and Magog is over, Jerusalem will be renewed and glorified immediately; and the devil, and Antichrist, and the false prophets will be cast into eternal fire. But the war of Christians for the Holy Land was finished a long time ago; and we do not see any renewal of Jerusalem, or the devil and the false prophets cast into hell. For right now, as even the adversaries admit, the devil and the false prophets are very active.

Moreover, God by manifest signs and prodigies both in Syrian Antioch and in other place has shown clearly that that war was pleasing to him. On this matter see Gulielmus Tyrius in book 6 on the holy war, and Paul Aemilius in book 4 on the war of the Franks.

Finally, St. Bernard, whom the same Bibliander says is a holy man in the Chronicle where he examines the time of Eugene IV, besides other saints living at the time was one of the main promoters of that war. For, both by his words and miracles he persuaded a huge multitude of Gauls and Germans to join in that war, as he himself says at the beginning of book 2 of his On Consideration. And the author of the life of Bernard in book 2, chapter 4 writes that Bernard, after the battle was over, informed a certain blind man with the testimony that he had preached in favor of that war in the name of God.

The sixth opinion is that of the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435, where they teach that Gog and Magog are the kingdom of the Saracens or Turks. This opinion is clearly opposed to the opinion of Bibliander; and so it is better, or rather less bad. However, absolutely it is false, since Gog will come in the last years, and he will not remain for a long time, as is easily gathered from Ezekiel and John. But the kingdom of the Saracens began a long time ago, and it has existed for almost a thousand years, which cannot in any way be said to be a short amount of time.

The seventh opinion is that of St. Ambrose in book 2, the last chapter of his treatise on Faith. According to him Gog is the Goths, who devastated many provinces of the Romans. St. Jerome mentions this opinion in his Hebrew questions on Gen. 10, and he says: *Whether or not it is true, the end of the battle will tell us.* And now, of course, the end of the war has taught us that it was not true. For, after the wars with the Goths no

renewal of the Church took place, and all wars did not cease.

The eighth opinion is that of St. Jerome himself in his comments on Ezek. 38. Seeing the difficulty of this matter, and having omitted the literal sense, he explained it mystically as being about heretics. For he wants Gog, which for Hebrews is a roof, to signify heresiarchs, who like a roof are raised on high and proud; but Magog, which is interpreted as being under the roof, signifies those who believe in the heresiarchs, and are subject to them, like a building under its roof. This opinion, taken in the mystical sense, is true, but it is not literal. For, Ezekiel in chapter 38 says that Gog will come in the last years, and John in Rev. 20 says that the same Gog will come after a thousand years. But by the phrase "a thousand years" all Catholics understand the total time which passes from the coming of Christ until the Antichrist. Therefore, since Gog will not come until about the end of the world, and heretics at the beginning of the Church appeared while the apostles were still living, it is certain that in the proper and literal sense Gog does not signify heretics.

It should also be noted that Jerome, when he says that Gog is to be interpreted as a roof, and Magog as under the roof, does not want to say that Gog and Magog are absolutely the same thing for Hebrews, which for us is a roof and under the roof, but he wants to say that it is more or less the same. For, in the proper sense for Hebrews a roof is not Gog, but Gag X and for "under the roof' they do not say Magog, but Miggag w.

The ninth opinion is that of St. Augustine in book 20, chapter 11 of *The City of God.* By Gog he understands the devil who is like a large roof, that is, of a large house in which many evil persons dwell. But by Magog he understands the army of Antichrist assembled from the nations of the whole world. This opinion without doubt is true, and to be embraced, since it refers Gog and Magog to the times of Antichrist, both because all Catholic authors follow it who write about the Apocalypse, like Arethas, Primasius, Bede, Haymo, Rupert, Richard, Anselm, and others; and also because all the things that are said by Ezekiel and John about Gog and Magog apply perfectly to Antichrist. For then truly there will be the last and greatest persecution, and after it Jerusalem will be renewed, that is, the Church will be glorified, and after that there will be no more wars. But since by "Gog" he understands the devil, it seems that this is not true; for, John says that when the devil is set loose he will gather together Gog and Magog for war; therefore, the devil is one thing and Gog is something else.

Our opinion, therefore, which is the tenth one, contains three parts. First, we say that the battle of Gog and Magog is the battle of Antichrist against the Church, as Augustine says correctly. Second, we say that it is quite probable that by "Gog" Antichrist himself is signified, and by "Magog" his army. For, Ezekiel constantly calls Gog a leader, and he calls Magog the land or the nation. Third, we say it is probable that Gog is said from Magog, and not the other way around, and Antichrist is said to be Gog, because he is the leader of the nation which is called Magog. In addition, the army of Antichrist is called Magog from the Scythian people, not because it is composed of Scythians, whom the Jews think are beyond the Caucasus and the Caspian Sea, but either because a large part of the army of Antichrist will be composed of barbarians coming from Scythia, like Turks, Tartars, and others, or (which I think is better) because it will be an immense and very cruel army; for when we want to say that others are fierce and cruel we call them Scythians.

For, that Magog signifies the Scythian people is evident from Gen. 10:2, where we read that the second son of Japheth was called Magog, from whom the region of Magog was named and where his descendants dwelled. Josephus in book 1, chapter 11 of the Antiquities says that this region is called Scythia, and Jerome says the same thing in his Hebrew questions relating to Gen. 10. For, as from the three sons of Ham, that is, Chus, Mezraim and Chanaan, Chus was called Ethiopia, Mezraim Egypt, and Chanaan Palestine; thus certainly from Magog the son of Japheth Scythia is called Magog. But that Ezekiel by using the name Magog was looking at the nation named for Magog, the son of Japheth, is clear, because in the same place he adds some companions to Gog, that is, other nations named from the other sons or nephews of Japheth, like Gomer, Togorma, Meschech, Tubal, etc. Therefore we conclude that the war of Gog and Magog will be the last persecution, which Antichrist will stir up in the whole world against the Church.

There is no problem in the fact that Ezekiel says in chapter 39 that the weapons of Gog and Magog will be burned for seven years, since it is certain that after the death of Antichrist there will be only 45 days until the end of the world, as is gathered from Daniel 12. For, Ezekiel is not speaking in the proper sense, but figuratively like the prophets, and he does not want to say that the weapons will really be burned for seven years, but that the future disaster will be so great that it will take a very long time to burn up the spears and shields of the killed men.

One doubt remains: Because of the fierce persecution of Antichrist will the faith and religion of Christ be totally extinguished? For, Dominic a Soto in book 4, distinction 46, question 1, article one of his Sentences believed that that was going to happen: *The separation and defection of the 'whole world from that See will be a sign of the end of the world.* And after that: *When the faith has been extinguished by the departure from the apostolic See, the whole world will be empty, and after that it will proceed in vain.* And then again: *Therefore mortal men will be exceedingly terrified at how deadly the love of self is. For from that flow elation and pride, which finally under the leadership of Antichrist will impair the city of God.*

But according to my judgment this opinion cannot be defended. For, first of all, it is contraiy to Augustine, who in book 20, chapter 11 of *The City of God* says that the Church will always remain unconquered by Antichrist: *But it shall not desert its military duty, which is signified by the word "camp."* Next, it seems to me also to be opposed to the gospel; for we read in Matt. 16:18: *On this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* But how will they not prevail, if they totally wipe it out? Likewise in Matt. 24:24 the Lord says about the ministers of Antichrist: *They will perform great signs, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect.* There the Lord wished to signify that there will be many of the elect in the future who will not allow themselves to be seduced by the miracles of Antichrist. Finally, all the authors who speak about the persecution of Antichrist, like Ezekiel, Daniel, Paul, John and all the Fathers cited above say that victory in that war or persecution finally will be in the hands of the Church. And surely reason itself teaches us the same thing. For who really believes, concerning that battle, in which with all their might God and the devil, Christ and Antichrist will fight each other, that God will be conquered by the devil and Christ by Antichrist?

CHAPTER XVIII

THE ABSURDITIES OF THE HERETICS, BY WHICH THEY DO NOT SO MUCH PROVE AS SHAMELESSLY AFFIRM THAT THE POPE IS ANTICHRIST, ARE REFUTED

Although what we have said so far about Antichrist could suffice, since we have shown clearly that none of those things pertain to the Sovereign Pontiff, which the divine Scriptures attribute to Antichrist, nevertheless, lest something be omitted and that the impudence of the adversaries may be made manifest, I will propose briefly and refute what Luther, the Smalkaldic Book, Calvin, Illyricus, Tilmannus and Chytraeus say in order to prove that the Pope is Antichrist.

And first of all Luther, although passim he calls the Sovereign Pontiff Antichrist, and especially in the book on the Babylonian captivity, still I was able to find only one of his arguments with which he tries to prove it. For, in article 27 of his Assertions he says this: *Daniel predicted in chapter 8 that Antichrist will be an impudent king exteriorly, that is, as Hebraeus says, powerful in appearance, pomps, and ceremonies of external works. However, the spirit of faith will be extinct, as we see fulfilled in so many religious groups, orders, colleges, rites, vestments, gestures, buildings, statues, rules, observances, so that the number of their names can hardly be listed.* And he enumerates these faces of the same Antichrist, as he says, and explains them at great length in his book against Ambrose Catharin on the power of Dan.

But this argument of Luther errs in three ways. First, in its foundation: for the Hebrew words QW literally mean *hard in the face,* and the Hebrew expression signifies a man with a rough face, who has no sense of shame. For, first of all, that is the way the LXX translates ἀναιδης προσώπω, *a shameless face.* Jerome translates it that way and so does Theodoretus; thus Francis Vatablus explains it based on the rules of the Rabbis: *Hard in the face,* he said, *is someone who does not blush and has no sense of shame.*

Finally, the same idea is gathered from similar words in Ezek. 3:7: *All the house of Israel are of a hard forehead and of stubborn heart. Behold, I have made your face hard against their faces.* There the Hebrew is: *The house of Israel has a hard face, and I have given you a face harder than theirs.* These words have no other meaning but this (as Jerome rightly explains): they are indeed shameless, but you will not succumb to their shame; although they do evil boldly and without shame, you will rebuke them boldly and without shame. Therefore, let Luther see if he has a shameless face, if he wants to prefer his interpretation to that of the Rabbis, Theodoretus, Jerome, the LXX, and Ezekiel himself.

Secondly, Luther's argument fails, because from this point of view, whatever it may mean, it is not rightly concluded that the Pope is Antichrist. For, even if it were established that Antichrist will be powerful in pomp and external ceremonies, still it cannot be concluded immediately that whoever is powerful in pomp and external ceremonies is Antichrist. For, as the logicians teach, from particular affirmative propositions nothing can be deduced; otherwise, Moses also was Antichrist, because he instituted so many ceremonies in Exodus and Leviticus that the number of them can hardly be counted. And

in the same place when it is said about Antiochus and his being a type of Antichrist that he will understand riddles, if the reasoning of Luther were correct, then it would follow that all those who can solve riddles are Antichrists; this certainly is false and ridiculous.

Thirdly, he errs because he attributes to the Roman Pontiff the institution of all orders, and ecclesiastical ceremonies, since it is certain that many of them were instituted not by the Roman Pontiff, but by other holy Fathers. For, the Greek Church always had, and still has, monasteries, rites, observations, ceremonies which they received from saints Basil and Pachomius, and the other Greek Fathers. See the book of Cassian on the Institutes and of St. Basil on his Constitutions. In the West also the orders of St. Benedict, St. Bruno, St. Dominic and St. Francis were indeed approved by the Pope, but they were invented and instituted under the guidance of the Holy Spirit by those holy men. Therefore, if those orders pertain to the face of Antichrist, then those Fathers should be called Antichrists rather than the Pope.

As a final point, the words of Daniel are fitting for no man (with the exception of Antichrist who will be revealed in his own time) more suitable than to Luther. For, above all others he has a shameless face. For, although he was a priest and monk, he openly married a nun, and in all of antiquity no example or precedent of such a thing can be demonstrated. Likewise, he writes lies without number, which have been pointed out by many authors in published books. John Cochlaeus writes concerning the works of Luther in the year 1523 that in one of Luther's books there are 50 lies; and he says that another proved that the same Luther was guilty of 874 lies. Finally, what kind of shamelessness did he have, since in his book against the Bull of Leo X the same Luther dared to excommunicate his Pontiff together with the whole Church that obeyed him? Who has ever heard that a bishop could be excommunicated by a priest?

The Council of Chalcedon was horrified at the audacity of Dioscorus, who presided at the Second Council of Ephesus and presumed to excommunicate Leo the Pontiff. But what comparison can be made between Dioscorus, the patriarch of the second most important See, while presiding over a general council, and Luther who was a simple monk writing in his cubicle? Now that we have answered Luther, let us move on to Melanchthon.

CHAPTER XIX

THE TRIFLES OF THE SMALKALDIC SYNOD OF THE LUTHERANS ARE REFUTED

There is a small book on the power and primacy of the Pope, or the kingdom of Antichrist, published under the name of the Smalkaldic synod, which seems to me to be the work of Melanchthon, but whoever the author is, the book contains nothing but words and inane boasting: *It is certain,* says the author of the book, *that the Roman Pontiffs with their associates defend an impious doctrine, and an impious cult, and certainly the marks of Antichrist are present in the kingdom of the Pope and in his associates.* That is the proposition, now let us hear the proofs: *For, Paul in his letter to the Thessalonians, when describing Antichrist, calls him the adversary of Christ, exalting himself above every so-called God or object of worship, and sitting in the temple like God. Therefore he is speaking about someone ruling in the Church, not about pagan kings, and he calls this man the adversary of Christ, and he has contrived a doctrine in conflict with the gospel, and he will arrogate to himself divine authority.*

Although all of these things, even if they were true, would not do us any harm, still I ask, what is the foundation for this interpretation? Paul openly says that Antichrist will exalt himself above every God, and will be seated in the temple, not as a king, not as a bishop, but certainly as God. Chrysostom, Ambrose, and other ancient interpreters of this text in clear words say the same thing. By what right, therefore, do you, without evidence and without good reason, say that Antichrist is the one seated in the temple, not as God, but as the bishop, and so does not exalt himself above every God, so that not only does he adore God the Father, and the Son and the Holy Spirit, but also before all the people prostrates himself before the sacrament of the Eucharist, before the tombs of the Apostles and martyrs, before the cross and images of Christ and of the saints, which you yourselves, though impiously, are wont to call foreign gods and idols?

But first if all it is certain that the Pope rules in the Church, and under the pretext of ecclesiastical authority that he has made for himself a kingdom. For he has invented these words, I will give you the keys.

You say that the Pope reigns in the Church, but you do not prove it; but we can demonstrate the contrary easily. For, one who reigns does not acknowledge any superior in his kingdom. The Pope, however, professes that he is the vicar of Christ and his servant. And although in the whole house of God and in the whole kingdom of Christ he exercises full authority, still that authority does not exceed the condition of a steward or servant. For, Moses also (as Paul says in Heb. 3:2) *was faithful in the whole house of God,* but as a servant; but Christ was there as the Son in his own house. But let us move on.

Then, the doctrine of the Pope conflicts in many ways with the gospel, and he arrogates to himself divine authority in three ways. First, because he claims for himself the right of changing the teaching of Christ, and the worship instituted by God, and he wants his teaching and his type of worship to be observed as divine.

Likewise, you say this and do not prove it, and also it seems to us to be not only false, but also a shameless lie. For, you are not ignorant that in the Catholic Church the doctrine

of Christ is taught by the mouth of all, and that the worship cannot be changed by any man, nor even by an angel; and between us and you there has never been a question whether what Christ taught or ordered must be believed. Now is it you, or is it we who are giving a better interpretation of the doctrine and precepts of Christ? Now in this question you are accustomed to offer almost nothing more than your own interpretation; but we present the consensus of the Fathers, and of the Catholic Church, or her decrees, or customs. For we do not oppose (as you falsely claim) the consensus of the Fathers and the decrees and customs of the Church to the word of God, but we oppose them to your interpretation and judgment.

Secondly, because he takes for himself the power not only of binding and loosing in this life, but also he takes to himself the power over souls after this life,

And again, this is stated but not proved. For, the Sovereign Pontiff does not claim a right for himself over the souls of those who have died, since he does not with his authority absolve them from sins or punishments, but all he does by way of suffrage is to communicate to them the prayers and good works of the living faithful. However, all the ancient authors teach that the prayers and alms of the living, and especially the sacrifice of the Mass are of benefit for the dead. Since elsewhere we have spoken at great length on this matter, here it will suffice to quote one text from Augustine. Therefore, in sermon 34 on the apostolic word Augustine says the following: *It is not to be doubted that the dead are helped by the prayers of the holy Church and the salutary sacrifice, and by the alms which are offered for their souls.* But let us move on.

Thirdly, because the Pope does not want to be judged by the Church, or by anyone else, and he takes his authority away from the judgment of councils and the whole Church. But this is to make oneself God, and to refuse to be judged by the Church or by anyone else.

Here also two things are said that are not proved. For, first of all, by what Scriptures, by what councils, by what reason do you prove that the Pope must be judged by councils or by the Church? For we read (to pass over other things which have been sufficiently considered in the previous book) that it was said to Peter by Christ in John 21:1 *Infeed my sheep;* and we believe it cannot be doubted that the sheep must be governed and judged by the shepherd, not the shepherd by the sheep. We read that also in Luke 12:42 which was said to the same Peter: *Who then is the faithful and wise steward, whom his master will set over his household?* In this place we see that a steward is placed by Christ over his whole family—certainly to govern it and not to be governed by it.

And lest perhaps someone might object: but what if that steward is evil, by whom will he be judged, if he is over all and is subject to no one? Therefore the Lord adds immediately: *But if that servant says to himself, "My master is delayed in coming," and begins to beat the menservants and the maidservants, and to eat and to drink and to get drunk, the master of that servant will come on a day when he does not expect him and at an hour he does not know, and will punish him, and put him with the unfaithful.* Do you hear who the judge is of that evil servant, whom the Lord set over his family? For Christ does not say he will be judged by a council, but *the Lord will come on a day when he does not expect him, etc.* Therefore the Lord reserves to himself the judgment of that servant,

whom he had set over his whole family. Therefore, the Pope does not take his authority from the judgment of councils and of the whole Church, since he does not allow himself to be judged by them; for he cannot take what has never been given. And the councils legally assembled have never claimed for themselves that, outside the case of heresy, they can pass judgment on the Sovereign Pontiff. But on this matter much will be said in the proper place.

You also say something else and do not prove, namely, that to refuse to be judged by the Church or by anyone else is to make himself God. For when you say "by anyone else," doubtless you mean by another man. For, you are not ignorant of the fact that the Pontiff both believes and confesses that he will be judged by Christ. So how does he make himself God, who believes that he will be judged by God?

Certainly earthly kings acknowledge no judge on earth in things pertaining to politics. And according to your view, since you deprive bishops of coercive power, in ecclesiastical matters they do not have any true judge. Therefore will there be as many Gods as there are kings? It remains, therefore, that it is not true that someone who wishes to be judged by no man immediately makes himself to be God.

Finally, you add this: *with the greatest severity he defends these very horrible errors and this impiety, and he kills those who disagree with him.*

But here you can know with what impudence you are lying from this one thing—which is that I myself who am writing these things openly assert that in the city of Rome itself (and the Pontiff is not ignorant of this) the Pontiff is not permitted to change Christian doctrine, nor the worship; and he cannot institute new types of worship as if they were from God, or which conflict with the gospel in any way; and still I am not killed by him, nor do I suffer any harassment. Indeed the Pontiff knows very well that I am speaking the truth, and that you are lying. As shortly thereafter when you add: *The doctrine about repentance has been corrupted completely by the Pope, and by his supporters; for he teaches that sins can be remitted because of the dignity of our works. Likewise, nowhere do they teach that because of Christ our sins are remitted gratis.* Surely these are not our dogmas, but your lies. For we do not teach this, but we do teach the exact opposite, as the Council of Trent clearly says in session 6, chapters 5,6,7 and 8. But that is enough about these things. Now I will turn to Calvin.

CHAPTER XX

CALVIN'S LIES ARE REFUTED

Therefore John Calvin, while explaining the text of the Apostle in 2 Thess. 2:4, *who exalts himself above every so-called God,* indeed says many things, and with great pomp of words, but he proves almost nothing: *Paul signified,* he said, *with these words that Antichrist will seize for himself things that are proper to the one God, so that he will exalt himself above every divine power, and all religion and worship of God will lie under his feet.* And after that: *Now anyone who has been taught by the Scriptures will see what is especially proper to God and what is opposed to him, and he will see what the Pope has usurped for himself, even if he is a boy ten years old who has not tried to recognize Antichrist.* Now this is a magnificent promise.

But let us hear with what reasons he demonstrates what he proposes. For perhaps they will be of such a nature that even ten year old boys will not have to work very hard in order to refute them. *Scripture says that the one God is the ruler* (Isa. 33:22), *who is able to save and to destroy* (Jas. 4:12). *It says that there is one king whose office it is to rule souls by his word and he is the author of all holy things. He teaches that justice and salvation are to be sought from the one Christ, and he assigns the means and the reason. There are none of these things that the Pope does not claim for himself as his own right; he glories in the fact that he can bind consciences by any laws that seem good to him and that he can impose eternal punishments. According to his own fancy he has instituted either new sacraments or he has corrupted and vitiated those that were instituted by Christ; indeed he has completely abolished them so that he could replace them with his own sacrileges. He has invented means of obtaining salvation that are absolutely foreign to the teaching of the gospel. Finally, he has not hesitated to change the whole religion according to his own good pleasure. What, I ask, is there in exalting oneself above everything that is called divine that the Pope has not done?*

Did I not say that many things are said by Calvin, but that little or nothing is proved? For, that the Pope glories in being able to bind consciences with any laws he pleases, that he institutes new sacraments, that he abolishes the old ones, that he invents means of salvation foreign to the teaching of the gospel, that he changes the whole religion—Calvin indeed says these things, but he does not prove them, unless for him to say something means to prove it; so to meet him on the same level, to deny what he says should be the same thing as a refutation.

Certainly all of us who are Catholics, and obey the Roman Pontiff as the vicar of Christ, say freely and we say it without any injury to him: he is not allowed to bind men with just any kind of laws, that is, even pernicious and wicked laws, nor can he institute new sacraments, nor can he corrupt or abolish those instituted by Christ; he cannot devise means of salvation foreign to the teaching of the gospel, nor pervert or change the Christian religion. We say this veiy freely because we know that he also thinks and says the same thing. For, if he does not think this way, and if he thinks he can establish wicked laws, institute new sacraments, abolish the old ones, and do other things of this

kind, then why does he permit us to speak in this way, since we are under his power, and we are teaching this not in some hidden place, but in the very city of Rome with his full knowledge and consent?

But they will say: the Pope does not say that he can do such things, but actually he claims he can do it by his deeds. Therefore, let it be proved that he did some of these things. For otherwise to assume what has to be proved, which is a regular habit of the adversaries, is called "begging the question" by the logicians.

In addition, those two texts of Isaiah 33 and James 4, which is all the evidence Calvin offers, are not opposed to our position. For, what Isaiah and James say: *there is one king, judge and legislator for us,* certainly does not conflict with the words in Prov. 8:15: *By me kings reign, and rulers decree what is just;* and with the words in Ps. 2:10: *Now therefore, O kings, be wise; be warned, O rulers of the earth,* and with the other six hundred places of the same kind. Therefore Isaiah and James do not make God the unique king, judge and legislator in just any way, but only for this reason that he alone is king, judge and legislator in such a way that he has to give an account to no one, he depends on no one, he reigns and judges and makes laws by his own authority, that is, it is not received from anyone else, and finally that he alone can also regarding execution condemn or save, as James says. We do not attribute any of these things either to the Pope or to other bishops.

CHAPTER XXI

THE LIES OF ILLYRICUS ARE REFUTED

Illyricus in the book he wrote against the primacy of the Pope said: *But among other arguments this one should remain firm, namely, -what at this time has been proved truly and clearly by many, that the Pope teaches and defends an impious doctrine, and that he himself is the Antichrist, and here I will repeat the reason for this. 1 John 2 defines that Antichrist is the one who denies that Jesus is the Christ. The Pope clearly does this, not in words, but in deeds. For Meschiach in Hebrew, Christ in Greek, is a person sent by God to be the perpetual priest and king of the people of God. The office of the priest is to teach, to pray and to sacrifice, but that of the king is to reign and to defend.* These are his words.

Now let us hear how he proves that the Pope took these offices away from Christ, and what testimonies, what reasons he provides. But, lest I am mistaken, we will hear only empty words: *Therefore the Pope removed the priesthood from Christ; for, not only does he want the beloved Son to be heard, but even more himself and his pseudo-apostles proclaiming another gospel. Likewise, because he has also substituted for us many other mediators in heaven in the place of Christ, who intercede for us before the Father, while neglecting Christ the severe judge. Likewise, because he has substituted innumerable little sacrifices, which please God for the human race, for which he says that the priesthood has been transferred from Christ through Peter. Finally, because through the merits of his spiritual persons and saints he says that we will be saved.*

Behold with what clear testimonies of the Scriptures Illyricus convinces us. What will he say, if we demonstrate that all of them are pure lies? For where, I ask, where have you read that the Pope wants to be heard more than Christ? We deny that and here is the proof. For, on the contrary, we see that great honor is given to the Scriptures by the Pope, and those who have taught anything contrary to the Scriptures have been taken for heretics. Then, is it not a clear lie that the Pope has substituted mediators for Christ, and that he wants them to intercede for us before the Father, while neglecting Christ? Do not our litanies begin in this way: Kyrie eleison, Christe eleison? Are not absolutely all of the prayers of the Church, which we read in the Mass and in the Divine Office, directed to God and are they not concluded with "through our Lord Jesus Christ"? Do we not acknowledge the mediation and intercession of Christ, when we ask anything of God, or want the saints to pray for us, and do we not seek all of this through the merits of Christ? For we do not put the saints in the place of God or of Christ, but we ask this of them that they join their prayers together with our prayers, so that in this way we may more easily obtain whatever we want from God through Christ.

Similarly, it is a lie that the Pope has substituted small sacrifices for Christ, and also that we say the priesthood of Christ has been transferred by Peter to small sacrifices. For you do not prove any of these things, nor can you ever prove them. And there cannot be any doubt but that if you had something, you would make it known. But this is what we say, namely, that Christ, who is the eternal priest, and is always living to intercede for

us, offered himself to God once and for all as a victim of propitiation through the death of the cross; but now, through the hands of priests, he offers himself again and again in a mysterious way.

And since many at this time baptize, still it is true what we read in John 1:33: *This is he who baptizes with the Holy Spirit.* For, the office of baptizing has not been transferred from Christ to priests, but it is he who always baptizes through the ministry of priests. Thus also, although many priests today offer Christ in the tremendous mysteries, nevertheless he is the primary priest, and truly the supreme Pontiff, who offers himself through the ministry of all the priests: *These works,* said Chrysostom in homily 83 on Matthew, *are not from any human power. He who then confected at the Last Supper, he it is who is also now working, he performs it, but we have the place of ministers.*

But I would willingly learn from you, Illyricus, since absolutely all the ancient authors, both Greek and Latin, mention the Eucharistic sacrifice and the priesthood of Christians, which no one denies except anyone who does not read. But why do you attribute this to the Roman Pontiff alone, that he has transferred the priesthood of Christ into small sacrifices? Now let us move on to other things.

What you add in the last place: *through the merits of his spiritual persons and saints he wants us to be saved,* is also a notable lie; otherwise, cite for us the place where the Pope said that. *But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will,* as St. Peter says in Acts. 15:11. And we acknowledge no other Savior but Jesus, and him crucified, who gave himself up as a ransom for all (1 Tim. 2:6).

Also, it cannot be denied that the merits and prayers of the saints also in their own way assist us, unless someone does not know or does not believe that there is a communication and connection between the members of the body of Christ. Concerning this matter, since we have treated it elsewhere, it will suffice to add just two testimonies in this place. Therefore, St. Augustine in question 149 on Exodus said: *In this way we are admonished, when our merits weigh heavily upon us and we think we are not loved by God, that we can be comforted before him by the merits of those whom God loves.* And again in book 21, chapter 27 of *The City of God,* he repeats several times that some obtain assistance by the merits of the saints, and that this was signified by the Lord when he said: *Make friends for yourselves by means of unrighteous mammon, so that when it fails they may receive you into the eternal habitations* (Luke 16:9). *But just as we have experienced* (St. Leo said in sermon 1 on the birth of the apostles) *and our elders have proved, we believe and trust that, among all the efforts of this life to obtain the mercy of God, that we are always helped by prayers of our special patrons, so that as we are oppressed by our own sins, so we are raised up by the apostolic merits.*

And although we are not accustomed to speak in this way, as Illyricus says, namely, that we are saved by the merits of spiritual persons, still if someone were to speak in that way, and he wanted to signify only that we are helped in some way by the merits of the saints to obtain salvation through Christ, he could not be more reprimanded than the Apostle Paul, who says in 1 Cor. 9:22: *I have become all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.* And the Apostle Jude in verse 23, who speaks in a similar way when he says: *Convince some, who doubt; save some, by snatching them out of the fire.*

And these things refer to the priesthood of Christ.

Illyricus continues: *Then he takes the kingdom away from Christ, because on earth he wants to be the head of the Church; but in heaven he has established for us other helpers and servants, to whom he orders us to flee in our miseries. Therefore the Pope denies that Jesus is the Christ.*

Here I ask this first of all: Where has the Pope or any Catholic called servants saints? Next I add this: if to assert about the head of the Church that he is under Christ, that he is his vicar and minister, which the Pope does, is to deny that Jesus is the Christ, why for the same reason is it so that, if someone says he is an agent of the king or the governor of some province, he is not immediately thought to deny that the king is his lord?

Finally, if to flee to the saints, as helpers in the midst of miseries, is to deny that Jesus is the Christ, how, I ask, did Paul not deny that Jesus is the Christ, since he says in Rom. 15:30: *I appeal to you, brethren, by our Lord Jesus Christ and by the love of the Spirit, to strive together with me in your prayers to God on my behalf, that I may be delivered from the unbelievers in Judea?* How did the great Basil not deny that Jesus is the Christ, since in oration 40 on the martyrs he said this: *Anyone who is oppressed by some trouble, let him flee to them; again anyone who is happy, let him pray to them; the former to be freed from his troubles, the latter that he may continue in his joy.* I am omitting the other Fathers; for I fear lest, if we examine them, we will find no one who did not deny that Jesus is the Christ, if the doctrine of Illyricus is true.

Illyricus continues. Daniel in chapter 11 *makes Antichrist known by several characteristics; first of all,* he said, *he will do what he wishes, and surely the Pope does whatever he pleases.*

But St. Daniel, when he says about Antichrist, *he will do what he wishes,* wants to signify that absolutely no superior is acknowledged by Antichrist, not even God himself, for this follows: *And he will be exalted against every God.* Therefore, Antichrist also, having set aside the law and dominion of God, will live according to his own way of choosing, which is something the Pope certainly does not do, because he does not deny that he is bound by the law of God, and he acknowledges Christ as his judge and superior.

He himself confesses, Illyricus said, *in dist. 40 "Si papa" that he draws innumerable souls with himself into hell; but no one dares to say to him, "What are you doing?" and the gloss,* he said, *of the Pope is to put will before reason.*

The canon, which begins with "Si papa," does not come from any Roman Pontiff (as Illyricus falsely claims), but it come from St. Boniface, the bishop of Mainz, the apostle of Germany and martyr; indeed he does not deny that the Sovereign Pontiff, if he leads an evil life, should be corrected and admonished out of fraternal charity; but he denies that he can by censured by some authority or to be judged, since he is the judge of all men. Boniface also in those words which precede the canon (as is to be seen in the new edition of the decree), calls the Roman Church in very clear words the head of all the Churches, and he says that the salvation of the whole Church, after God, depends on the safety of the Roman Pontiff.

Therefore I ask Illyricus: Is the opinion of St. Boniface, apostle of the Germans, true or not? For if it is not true, why is there an objection to us? If it is true, why is it not

accepted? If it is true, then truly the Roman Pontiff is the head of all the Churches, and he will judge all and will not be judged by anyone. Wherefore let Illyricus cease now to cite canons, which cannot help him in any way. In what pertains to that gloss, Illryicus should know that it was either removed by the Pontiff from that new edition of the decree as being false, or else it never was in the decree; I certainly have not been able to find it.

Illyricus continues. Secondly, (Daniel) says *that he exalted himself above God and the Pope did that as is apparent from what had preceded. Likewise, because he wants himself to be heard more than God and blaspheming cries out that Scripture is the fount of all heresies and schisms, is ambiguous and obscure, etc.*

But it is necessaiy to cite the words of Daniel faithfully; for he does not say, *he will exalt himself above God,* but, *he will be exalted contrary to every God.* And after than: *And he will not care for any of the Gods, because he will rise up against all of them.* This mark clearly demonstrates that the Pope has nothing in common with Antichrist. For, Antichrist will have respect for no God; but the Pope worships the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. But he not only does that, but also (if we are to believe you) he openly adores too many Gods, all the saints in heaven, images on earth, and relics under the earth.

Now you also add this: that the Pope cries out that Scripture is the fount of heresies and schisms. I certainly have never read this in any of the writings of the Popes, but I hear that this is a saying of your Luther that Scripture is the book of heretics (Luther in the preface to the histoiy that took place in Strasburg in the year 36). But if this saying is understood correctly, I do not see why it is deservedly reprimanded. For, St. Hilary also in his book on the synods demonstrates that many heresies have taken their origin from the divine writings that are badly understood.

And Tertullian in his book on prescription said even more boldly: *I do not dare to say that the Scriptures themselves also are so arranged by the providence of God, that they supply materials to heretics, when I read: heresies are necessary, which cannot exist without the Scriptures.*

In addition, not only does the Pope teach truly that the Scriptures are ambiguous and obscure in many places, but also all the ancient Fathers. And so Luther himself, whether he wanted to or not, was forced to admit this, since in his preface to the Psalms he wrote the following: *I did not want this to be presumed of me by anyone, what until now none of the holy and learned men have been able to offer, that is, to understand and teach the Psalter in all things according to its genuine meaning. It is enough to have understood some things, and even those things only partially. The Spirit has reserved many things for himself, whereby he has us always as his disciples; many things he shows only to attract, and many things he reveals in order to move us.* And after that: *I know that he is a man of shameless temerity who dares to claim that he has understood one book of Scripture in all its parts.* The same Luther also in his book on the Councils and the Church (p. 52) openly confesses that he sought the true and genuine meaning of Scripture with much sweat. Finally, there are so many translations of Scripture, so many interpretations, so many different sects among the adversaries—what does all this mean but that Scripture is ambiguous and obscure?

Thirdly, (Daniel) *says that things will go favorably for him* (Antichrist), *until he is terminated by the wrath of God; the Pope oppresses as he wishes with his tyranny and impiety, both political states and also innumerable Churches.*

And by what reason and by what authority do you prove this? Can you say which states and which Churches the Roman Pontiff has oppressed? What will you say, if we demonstrate on the contrary that a sign fully contrary to the third characteristic of Antichrist pertains to the Pope? For since that time, in which according to you the Pope began to be Antichrist, not only did his empire not grow, but it always decreased more and more. At the time of Leo the Great, that is, a hundred and fifty years before Antichrist was born according to your view, the Roman Pope presided over more nations than the boundaries of the whole Roman Empire. For thus writes the same Leo in sermon 1 on the birth of the apostles: *Through the holy chair of St. Peter, being the head of the world, you* (Rome) *extend farther by the divine religion than you do by the earthly dominion. For although you have been increased by your many victories, and the rule of your empire extends over land and sea, still what your bellicose efforts have subdued is less than what the Christian peace has acquired.* And Prosper in the book on Ingratitude said:

The seat of Peter is Rome, which being the pastoral honor
Became the head of the world; whatever she does not
Possess by her arms, she hold by religion.

But afterwards, while Antichrist (as you say) was reigning, gradually the Roman See lost almost all of Africa, most of Asia, and all of Greece. But in our times, in which you claim that Antichrist is raging intensely, everything has proceeded so favorably for him that he has lost a large part of Germany, Sweden, Prussia, Norway, all of Denmark, and a good part of England, Gaul, Switzerland, Poland, Bohemia and Panonia. Therefore, if to act favorably is a quality of Antichrist, not the Pope, who has lost so many provinces, but Luther, who by his preaching has seduced so many peoples, and has acted so favorably, so that from being a private monk he has become the prophet of Germany and a quasi Pope, deservedly can be said to be the Antichrist. But let us move on.

Fourthly (Daniel), *says that he will not cultivate the gods of his own fathers. Above in the quote from John we proved clearly that this is said truly about the Pope.* And in the same place we even more clearly refuted this claim. Therefore, let us move to the next point.

Fifthly, *he says that he will not have any care for the love of women; the Pope has done this—both by demanding celibacy for his priests, and by his own sodomistic wantonness.*

Here I omit speaking about your temerity, whereby you dare to utter anything whatever. In the meantime, while considering this of little importance, can the things which you say be proved or not? I will not omit this, that although the words of Daniel found in the Greek texts read as you say, nevertheless they have been translated by St. Jerome from the Hebrew source in a completely contrary way. For, he translates it this way: *And he will be in the desires of women.* And although the Hebrew words D'w:

man V]? signify only "in the desire of women," and they have no modifier by which it could be known whether the Antichrist will be or will not be caught in the desires of women, nevertheless there are two conjectures which make the version of St. Jerome more probable.

One, which is certain, is that Antiochus, about whom literally Daniel is speaking, and who acts as a type of the Antichrist, was very much addicted to the love of women. *Antiochus,* Jerome said in his Commentary on this place, *is said to have been very voluptuous, and to have fallen into such disgrace through his debauchery and corruption of the royal majesty that he was publicly ridiculed by mimic plays and prostitutes, and he satisfied his lust in the presence of the people.* Since that is so, indeed how credible is it concerning such a king that Daniel would say that he is not caught up in the desires for women?

Another conjecture is that, since Antichrist will be the Messiah of the Jews, and the Jews besides other goods expect a multitude of wives from the Messiah, it is in no way probable that Antichrist will command or praise celibacy.

Finally, I will add that if it is a sign of Antichrist that he forces celibacy on priests, then not only the Pope, but also all the ancient Fathers, including also the Apostles, were Antichrists. For (and I omit other things which will be treated in their proper place) listen to what the Fathers said at the second council of Carthage in canon 2: *It pleases all that bishops, priests, deacons, or those who receive the sacraments, as defenders of chastity also abstain from their wives, so that what the apostles taught, and antiquity itself has preserved, we also will defend.* But let us move on.

Sixthly, *he says* (Daniel) *that he will worship the God Moazim with gold and silver, which he made, while he gives his total devotion to him, so that many great temples, beautifully built, will shine with all kinds of precious jewels and will resound with singing.*

Many things have already been said above concerning the God Moazim, where we showed that the God Moazim is either Antichrist himself, or the devil, whom Antichrist secretly worships. But our Illyricus seems to me to make Jesus Christ the God Moazim, which surely is an intolerable blasphemy. For, all the temples, which are beautifully built, and have been adorned with gold and silver by the Roman Pontiffs, and there is no one who does not know that they have been consecrated and dedicated to Christ as God. But if the one worshipped in temples of this kind is the God Moazim, who does not see that Christ himself is the God Moazim? But the construction and adornment of these temples did not begin in the year 666, the year in which the adversaries say Antichrist appeared, but almost three hundred years before that time.

Listen to what Eusebius says in book 9, chapter 10 of Ruffinus's translation in his ecclesiastical history: *Because of that all were filled with joy as a divine gift, especially those who saw the places, which shortly before had been destroyed by the impious practices of the tyrants, take shape through a more beautiful and sturdy construction, and saw lofty temples replace the humble assembly places.* Listen to Cyril of Jerusalem in Catechism 14: *Therefore those who now are pious kings built the holy Church of the resurrection in which we now are, while adorning it with silver and gold; they made it splendid with silver monuments.*

See moreover, if you please, what has been said about the magnificence of the Christian temples, and the beauty of the sacred vessels of the Church by the following: Eusebius in books 3 and 4 on the life of Constantine, Gregory of Nyssa in his oration on the holy martyr Theodore, Gregory Nazianzen in Oration 1 on Julianus, Chrysostom in homily 66 to the people of Antioch, Cyril of Alexandria in the book on the right faith to Regina, Damasus in the life of St. Sylvester, Ambrose in book 2, chapter 21 on Offices, Jerome in his Commentary on Zech. 8, Augustine on Ps. 114, Paulinus on St. Felix, Prudentius in a hymn on St. Laurence, and Procopius in the book on buildings. Certainly all of these lived before the time of Antichrist, and still they testify that during their time there were buildings and adornments of the Christian temples, so that the ones we now see can in no way be compared with those.

Seventhly, *he says* (Daniel) *that it will come about that Antichrist will enrich his companions, and the Pope has done that.*

Indeed, he very much enriched John Eck, John Cochlaeus, John Roffenses, Latomus, Dreidon, Tapperus, Peter a Soto, and many other learned men who, since they were working day and night to refute your follies, never received even a small coin from the Roman Pontiff. Also they did not expect any payment from men, since they were working principally for the glory of God. But if the Roman Pontiff attributed an opulent priesthood to cardinals and bishops, he is not thought to enrich them so much as the piety of the faithful, which gave such a gift to the Churches.

Illyricus continues: *Paul in 2 Thess. 2 presents five marks of Antichrist, besides those already mentioned.* First, *that he will be seated in the temple of God. The Pope does this, by imagining himself to be the vicar of Christ, and by reigning over the consciences of men. For if he should proclaim himself to be an enemy of Christ, like the Mohammedans, he would be outside the Church.*

But Paul, O Illyricus, not only says the Antichrist will be seated in the temple of God (for every bishop sits in the temple of God), but he explains the way in which he will sit in the temple of God, saying, *proclaiming himself to be God* ὁπ ἐσπ θεός; but the Pope, according to what you say, makes himself the vicar of God, and in this way not God. For the vicar of God cannot be God, unless you imagine that there are lesser and greater Gods. Then I ask you: If the Pope is not outside the Church, as you say in this place, and therefore is in the Church, where, I ask, are you and your followers? Are you not outside the Church? For the Church is one, and the Pope is seated in it. You therefore who are not in it, are in no Church. But let us now hear something else.

Second, *what he says now is a mystery; I think it has to do with the Roman Pontiff who shortly thereafter began to raise his head above others.*

Indeed this is what I noted briefly above, following Nicholas Sanderus, who previously had seen and written the same thing, namely, that for you St. Peter is Antichrist, but Simon Magus or Nero is the Christ. For, Paul does not say that the mystery of iniquity will operate a little afterwards, but is operating now. Wherefore if this mystery pertains to the Roman Pontiff, it pertains necessarily also to St. Peter. And if St. Peter, which the mind dreads to think and the hand trembles to write, was Antichrist, who does not see that Simon and Nero, the enemies of St. Peter, were Christ and God? But you may have

for yourself Gods and Christs of that kind, and we do not envy you on that account. But let us continue.

Thirdly, *he says that Antichrist will come with mendacious signs; on the basis of our experience, this is what the Pope has done.*

Fourthly, *he says that God will send the efficacy of an illusion; this has clearly happened in the papacy. For we believed the Pope much more firmly than we did God.*

We considered above in chapter 15 the miracles of Antichrist, and the shameful lie which Illyricus says is a result of his experience. For the Pontiffs have not performed any true or false miracles, neither in this century nor in the previous one, but during which they say Antichrist reigned effectively. But concerning what he adds about the efficacy of illusion, there is no one who does not see how easily this can be turned back against the adversaries. For what greater efficacy of illusion can be imagined than that those men are found at this time who prefer to put their faith in two or three apostates, rather than in the universal Church, all the Councils and all the Fathers, and who besides their admirable doctrine and extraordinary holiness of life were renowned for their many signs and miracles?

Now what Illyricus cites from Ambrose, in order to explain the fifth mark, has been refuted above in the second demonstration in which we proved that Antichrist has not yet come.

Illyricus adds lastly something from *1 Tim. 4 that in the later times some will depart from the faith. The Pope says that there is another faith besides the historical. They will give heed to deceitful spirits. The Pope proves everything from visions of spirits and dead souls. They will forbid marriage and enjoin abstinence from foods; both of these are true and well-known about the Pope.*

Now, my good man, the Pope learned from Paul that there is one faith: *There is one God,* the Apostle said to the Ephesians in 4:5, *one faith, one baptism.* And Paul never defined that this one faith is fiducial by resting on the promise and word of God, as you define it in Centuries, 1, books 2, chapter 4, col. 262. But he says to the Romans in 10:8-9: *This is the word of faith which we preach, because if you confess with your lips that Jesus is Lord and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved.* And to the Hebrews in 11:3 he says: *By faith we understand that the world was created by the word of God.*

Who does not know that it pertains to sacred history both that Christ rose from the dead and that the world was created by the word of God? However, we do not call that one, unique and true faith, whereby we most certainly believe whatever God has deigned to reveal through the apostles and prophets, the historical faith, but the Catholic faith. For we leave to you the novelties of new words.

Since you add this, that the Pope proves everything by visions of spirits and dead souls, I do not know what spirit has revealed this to you. For we, in order to confirm things that pertain to the status of souls, sometimes produce something from the apparitions of souls, from the approved and ancient authors. An example of this is what Eusebius writes about the apparition of Saint Potamiaena in book 6, chapter 5 in his ecclesiastical history, and what St. Augustine recounts about the apparition of St. Felix Nolanus in chapter 16

of his book on prayers for the dead. But in order to confirm dogmas I do not know about any Catholic who ever cited visions of souls to do that. But this is not your first lie.

What you say in the last place about the prohibition of food and marriage is refuted clearly enough by Augustine in book 30, chapter 6 against Faustus where he says this: *So, again, if your exhortations to virginity resembled the teaching of the apostle, "He who gives in marriage does well, and he who gives not in marriage does better;" if you taught that marriage is good, and virginity better, as the Church teaches which is truly Christ's Church, you would not have been described in the Spirit's prediction as forbidding to marry. What a man forbids he makes evil; but a good thing may be placed second to a better thing without being forbidden. And after that: You see, then, that there is a great difference between exhorting to virginity as the better of two good things, and forbidding to many by denouncing the true purpose of marriage; between abstaining from food as a symbolic observance, or for the mortification of the body, and abstaining from food which God has created for the reason that God did not create it. In one case, we have the doctrine of the prophets and apostles; in the other, the doctrine of lying devils.*

Illyricus concludes: *Therefore it is certain from these signs that the Pope is the true Antichrist himself, about which the Scriptures have prophesied.*

But perhaps he would conclude more fittingly in this way: therefore it is certain from these lies that Illyricus is one of the precursors of the one whom St. Daniel a long time before predicted would be shameless in what he says.

CHAPTER XXII

THE TRIFLES OF TILMANN ARE REFUTED

Tilmannus Heshusius in the book which he wrote on the six hundred errors of the Pontiffs, since he should have written about the six hundred errors of Lutherans, gave it the proper title about the Antichrist; the title is 33, and it includes four errors. Therefore he says the following:

First, *the Pontiffs say the Antichrist will come from Babylon and will belong to the tribe of Dan. Compendium of Theology, book 7, chapter 8.*

We can give thanks to Tilmann, who teaches that there are such ancient and such holy Pontiffs. For, if there are Pontiffs who say that Antichrist will come from the tribe of Dan, then certainly the pontiffs are Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Ambrose, Augustine, Prosper, Theodoretus, Gregory, Bede, Arethas, Rupert, Anselm and Richard; for all of these, as we showed above in chapter 12, by common consent teach that Antichrist will be born of the tribe of Dan. But let us move on.

Secondly, *the Papists deny that the Roman Pontiff with his associates is the true Antichrist, when it is proved and demonstrated by valid and clear testimonies of the divine word.*

But we have not yet seen those testimonies; and they are not to be found anywhere in our Hebrew, Greek and Latin Bibles. For the testimonies cited by you do not even mention the name of the Roman Pontiff.

Thirdly, *they teach that Antichrist will reign only for three and a half years. Compendium of Theology, etc.*

But here we give immortal thanks to you, because you admit that not only all the ancient Fathers, but also the prophet Daniel and the evangelist John are Papists. And surely I feel sorry for you and your followers, because you have only a few authors, while you have turned over to the Papists all the learned and approved Fathers. Please see what we said above in chapter 8, and you will find taught in clear words what you say the Papists teach, that is, by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Cyril, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoretus, Primasius, Arethas, Bede, Anselm, Richard, Rupert, and also Daniel and John.

Fourthly, *they teach that Antichrist will be killed on the Mount of Olives. Compendium of Theology,* book 7, chapter 14.

But here also you make great men to be Papists, since Jerome concludes from Daniel and Isaiah in his Commentary on Dan. 11 that Antichrist will be killed on the Mount of Olives. Theodoretus also, writing about this same text, although he does not name the Mount of Olives, still he says that Antichrist will be killed not far from Jerusalem. But let us see now with what arguments you refute the stated errors. For you supply the antidote immediately in these words.

The pontifical trifles about Antichrist, because they are not founded on any testimony of Holy Scripture, are to be rejected and detested. For, as Jerome rightly says, what does not have authority in Scripture can be rejected with the same ease with which it is asserted. And Paul warns us to be on our guard against the traditions of men in Col. 2:4:

I say this in order that no one may delude you with beguiling speech, etc. Likewise: *See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy, etc. What should be thought about Antichrist must be sought from the word of God, as we see in 1 John 2:22: Who is the liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ?* Likewise in 2 Thess. 2:4: *The man of lawlessness and the son of perdition exalts himself above every God, etc.* Likewise Matt. 24:11: *Many false prophets will arise and lead many astray, etc.* Daniel 11:39: *And he shall deal with the strongest fortresses of the God Moazim.* Likewise in Rev. 17:6: *And I saw the woman, drunk with the blood of the saints and the blood of the martyrs of Jesus. From these testimonies of Holy Scripture it is clearly apparent what the Christian faith is concerning Antichrist, whom Christ and the apostles predicted was going to come. And it is clearer than the midday sun that each text applies precisely to the Roman Pontiff; so there should be no doubt but that the tyrannical Roman Pontiff is the wicked Antichrist.* These are his words.

Another error is refuted in this way. As Jerome rightly says, what does not have the authority of Scripture can be denied with the same ease with which it is affirmed. But Paul says, *the man of lawlessness and the son of perdition exalts himself above every* GoiZin 2 Thess. 2:4; therefore the Papists err when they deny that the Pope is Antichrist.

Thirdly in this way and stronger, because in two Scriptures Paul says: *I say this in order that no one may delude you with beguiling speech, etc.* in Col. 2:4; but *false Christs and false prophets will arise, and they will perform many signs, etc.* in Matt. 24; therefore the error of the Pontiffs is intolerable, since they say Antichrist will reign for three and a half years.

Finally, in this way and very strong, because Paul warns us in three Scriptures: *See to it that no one makes a prey of you by philosophy, etc.* in Col. 2:8; but Antichrist will make a fortress of the God Moazim in Dan. 11:39 and John sees the woman drunk with the blood of the saints in Rev. 17:6; therefore the Papists are totally wrong when they say that Antichrist will be killed on the Mount of Olives.

The fair reader will forgive me because I treat Tilmann with such ridicule. For, the impudence of the man forces me, since he produces nothing worthy of a refutation. Nevertheless he so chatters, and so glories, as if he had produced demonstrations more certain and more clear than mathematics.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE LIES OF CHYTRAEUS ARE REFUTED

David Chytraeus in his Commentary on Rev. 9 explains the vision of John whereby when the fifth angel blew his trumpet he saw first of all a huge star fall from heaven on the earth, and to him was given the key of the shaft of the bottomless pit; then from the shaft rose very dense smoke, which darkened the sun and the air; then from the smoke came locusts on the earth, which shortly thereafter were arrayed like a horse, and lions and scorpions, and men armed for battle. Chytraeus, I say, while explaining this vision, thought it was so fitting for the Roman Pontiff, and he wanted it to be so understood by others, that he said: *There is no doubt that Antichrist or the order of the Roman papacy is described in this vision.*

And he teaches that the beginning of this vision must be taken from the year of the Lord 600, and the star falling from heaven is Gregory the Great and his successors who, having discarded the keys of the kingdom of heaven, received the keys of the shaft of the bottomless pit. He also says the smoke coming from the pit is the corruption of doctrine and the various traditions of the Roman Pontiffs. Finally, he says that the plague of locusts is the bishops, clerics, monks, etc., and in order to remove that smoke in some way he proposed an antithesis to the pontifical and evangelical teaching, or antichristian and Christian, which includes twelve articles as if it were another apostolic creed.

But this opinion of his can be refuted in many ways. First, because it is based on no evidence. For the ancient interpreters, like Arethas, Bede, Primasius, Anselm, Rupert, and others in comments on this text understand by the star, which fell from heaven, as the devil, not some bishop. For, it is said about the devil in Isa. 14:12: *How you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of the Dawn!* And because the devil fell a longtime before John wrote the Apocalypse, accordingly the Fathers point out that John did not say: *I saw a star falling from heaven,* but *I saw a star that had fallen from heaven on the earth.* For, John saw that star already present on earth, which formerly shone brightly in heaven. And what follows fits the devil perfectly: *And he was given the key of the shaft of the bottomless pit.* For, just as Christ has and communicates to his own the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and reigns in the minds of the faithful and devout, so the devil has the keys of the shaft of the bottomless pit, and reigns over the sons of disbelief, and in Scripture passim he is called: *the prince of darkness, the prince of this world, the God of this age* (John 12 and 14,2 Cor. 4, Eph. 6, Col. 1, and elsewhere). He is also the one who, God permitting, sends forth the smoke of error from the pit, and sends a new plague of locusts, that is, new heretics with their followers into the area of the Church in almost every century. Secondly, because the opinion of Chytraeus contradicts what John says in the same chapter about the sixth angel, and the sixth persecution. For, St. John in Rev. 8 and 9 describes by the six trumpets of the angels the six persecutions of the heretics, which will take place from the time of the apostles until the end of the world. And the same Chytraeus himself by the first trumpet understands very well

the heresy of the Ebionites, which arose in the time of the apostles; by the second he understands the heresy of the Gnostics, which followed later; by the third, the heresy still later of Samosate and Arius; by the fourth, the heresy of Pelagius, which came after all the others.

Now if by the fifth is understood the persecution of the Roman Antichrist, which, as they also admit, is the last persecution, what shall we understand by the sixth trumpet? Chytraeus responds that by the sixth trumpet is understood the persecution of the Mohammedans and Turks. But this is not rightly said, both because Mohammedans are not heretics, but pagans, and also because the persecution of Mohammed will not follow the persecution of Antichrist, but will precede it, as we think, or will take place at the same time, as Chytraeus says. Therefore, Chytraeus is forced to confuse the fifth trumpet with the sixth, since he quite openly refers the remaining ones to different times. Therefore, Catholics in a better way understand the sixth trumpet as the persecution of Antichrist, which truly will be the last and most severe one. But by the fifth trumpet, many with great probability think it is a very pernicious heresy, which proximately precedes the time of Antichrist, and is indeed the Lutheran heresy.

Thirdly, because Chytraeus is totally mistaken, when he teaches that the falling star is St. Gregory. For, St. Gregory, if any faith can be put in the historians, did not fall from heaven to earth, but he ascended from earth to heaven. For, from a magistrate he became a monk and from a monk a bishop, and he never returned from the episcopacy to the praetorship, nor from being a monk to the world. Just as also the Greeks Basil. Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and the Latins Martin, Paulinus, Augustine, became from being laymen monks, from monks bishops, and no one ever said that they for this reason fell from heaven onto the earth. Then Gregory was second to none with regard to continence, sobriety, and love of heavenly things. But in humility he surpassed almost everyone. Nevertheless Chytraeus dares to say that he fell from heaven, that is, from the heavenly life to the earth, to an earthly and pleasant life. Finally, Luther himself also says in his book on reckoning the time that Gregory was a holy Pontiff, and Theodore Bibliander following Luther in tab. 1 of his Chronology exalts the same Gregory with admiring praises, and he says it is possible to be known from his books how much he progressed in the study of piety and doctrine. Surely all of this is true; for his writings breathe forth an admirable sanctity. And that is not less vain what the same Chytraeus adds about the smoke from the bottomless pit, which he interprets as the corruption of doctrine introduced into the Church by Gregory and his followers. For, Gregory did not introduce anything new that pertains to doctrine; but in what pertains to liturgy and discipline, he corrected many things that had crept in by abuse; he restored many things which had been lost by the negligence of the times. After mature deliberation he did introduce a few new things, as can be known, both from the four books on his life written by Deacon John, and from his own letter 63 in book 7, where he gives the reason for the liturgical changes which he renewed or instituted. But this will become very clear, if we consider the antithesis of the evangelical and pontifical doctrine, which Chytraeus proposes, and to which often afterwards he sends back his readers.

I. ON THE TRUE ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND INVOCATION OF GOD

The gospel teaches that one only God is to be invoked and worshipped, as he prescribed in his word that he should be worshipped, and all the confidence of our salvation is to be placed only in the goodness and mercy of God, The Pontiffs command that there is not only one true God, but also to invoke dead men and the saints, and in dangers to ask for help and assistance, and to expect it. Then also, obviously like the pagans, they bind the invocation and worship of God to certain statues, as if by invoking this or that statue, God will be more propitious than otherwise.

Since concerning these controversies, which are touched on in this antithesis, we have considered extensively elsewhere, here we will demonstrate only briefly that the doctrine which is called Pontifical by Chytraeus does not contradict the word of God and did not begin during the time of St. Gregory.

Therefore, the word of God indeed teaches that the one God alone is to be worshipped and invoked, by the invocation and adoration, which is due to God alone. For the true God, who is also a jealous God, does not permit that we have any creature whatsoever as our creator. In the meantime, however, the same word of God commands that we honor his more excellent creatures, which we also invoke, not indeed as God, but as friendly and dear to God. Just as kings take it ill, if they see royal honors being conferred on their servants, but they freely accept it when they bring it about that the same servants are honored and praised: David said in Ps. 99, *Worship at his footstool.* And Job in chapter 5:1: *Call now,* he said, *is there anyone who will answer you? To which of the holy ones will you turn?* Therefore, Obadiah, a great and holy man, adored Elijah by falling on his face (1 Kings. 18:7). And the sons of the prophets, when they heard that the spirit of Elijah was resting on Elisha, went over to him *and they bowed to the ground before him* (2 Kings. 2:15). And the Apostle Paul in almost all his letters asks the Christians for prayers, that by them he might be freed from many dangers. And no reason can be given why the honor due to God is diminished, if we beseech from the spirits of the saints that they pray to God for us; and it is also not diminished if we ask for the same thing from the living.

Finally, St. Ambrose lived 200 years before St. Gregory, and still in his book on widows he says the following: *The angels, who have been given to us for our protection, should be entreated; the martyrs should be implored, because they can help us when we pray over their bodies.* And after that: *We are not ashamed to use these intercessors because of our infirmity.*

In addition, we do not bind worship and invocation to the statues of saints, to the memory of the martyrs, and to other religious monuments otherwise than formerly God bound it to the sanctuary, that is, to Solomon's temple. For although God does not hear everywhere, and in every place we can raise up our hands to God, nevertheless not without cause did the Holy Spirit in Isa. 56 and Christ in Matt. 21 call the temple of God the house of prayer. And not without cause did the pious Emperor Theodosius (as for now I omit mentioning several examples of antiquity) visit all the places of prayer with the priests and people; he prostrated himself in sackcloth and ashes before the tombs of the

martyrs and apostles, and he asked for help for himself by the intercession of the saints. And certainly Theodosius, who did this, and Ruffinus, who wrote about it in book 2, chapter 33 of his ecclesiastical history, preceded St. Gregory by almost 200 years.

II. ON THE OFFICE AND BENEFACTIONS OF CHRIST

The gospel teaches, because of the one and only Son of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, who was crucified, died and resurrected for us, freely gave us the remission of our sins and eternal salvation not because of any works or merits of ours. And this honor is proper to the one God only, as is said in Isa. 43:25:1, I am He who blots out your transgressions. Likewise, there is salvation in no one else. The Pontiffs, on the contrary, teach that not because of the merits of Christ alone, but partially because of Christ, partially because of our own contrition, and obedience or good works, we are justified and find salvation, etc.

Catholic doctrine does not each that sinners are justified partly by Christ and partly because of their own works, as if also the works themselves can merit something without Christ. In fact, we distinguish three kinds of works. One kind is those that take place by the powers of nature alone, without faith and the grace of God, and concerning these we say clearly with the Apostle that man is not justified by his works, but by faith, and if anyone were justified by works of this kind he would have glory, but not before God, as Paul says about Abraham in Rom. 4:2. Therefore, regarding these works there is no controversy between us, although passim by a shameless lie you attribute to us that we teach that works without faith in Christ are meritorious.

The second is the kind of works that proceed from faith and the grace of God, and dispose a person for reconciliation with God and the forgiveness of his sins, such as prayer, almsgiving, fasting, sorrow for sins, and similar things. We do not say that these works are meritorious from the justice of the reconciliation itself, but on the contrary rather we listen to the Council of Trent saying in session 6, chapter 8, that men are justified freely, because neither the faith nor the works which precede justification merit it, that is, from justice, as if the justification were due to works of this kind. But we confess that these works, because they proceed from faith and the divine assistance, are divine works and in their own way merit, that is, impetrate the forgiveness of sins. For, even though you do not concede this, still the word of God concedes it. For what is it that Ezekiel says in 18:27: *When a wicked man turns away from the wickedness he has committed he shall save his life?* What is it that Jonah says in 3:10: *When God saw what they did* (fasting and wearing sackcloth) *he had mercy on them?* What is it that Christ says in Luke 7:47: *Her sins, which are many, are forgiven her, for she loved much?*

Also, not only did Gregory teach this, but also many Fathers before him. Ambrose in book 10 on Luke said: *They do not beg for forgiveness with a tear, but they merit it.* Jerome in book 2 against the Pelagians: *Those who simply confess their sins, by their humility merit the mercy of the Savior.* Augustine in letter 105: *The forgiveness of sins is not without some merit, if faith begs for it. And there is some merit of faith according to which he said: God, be merciful to me a sinner. This man went down to his house justified*

because of his faith and humility. And in letter 106: *And if someone says that faith merits the grace of working well, we cannot deny it, indeed we gratefully admit it.*

Finally, the last kind of works is that of those which are done by a justified man, and proceed from the Holy Spirit dwelling in the heart of man and diffusing charity into him.

To these works, whether you agree or not, we attribute merit; not that by which they merit the forgiveness of sins, which preceded, and which properly cannot fall under the notion of merit, but glory and eternal beatitude truly and properly, for otherwise why is it that Paul says in 2 Tim. 4:7: *I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will award to me on that Day?* For if eternal life is not truly the reward for good works, why does he call it the crown of justice, and not rather a gift of mercy? Why is it said to be rendered, and not donated? Why from a just judge, and not from a generous king? Rightly, therefore, Augustine said in letter 105: *Hence eternal life itself, which surely will be obtained at the end without an end, and therefore is rendered for preceding merits, nevertheless because the same merits, whereby it is rendered, were not acquired by us through our own sufficiency, but were communicated to us by grace, are also called grace; not therefore because it is not given with merits, but also because the merits themselves have been given, by which eternal life is given.*

And those two testimonies of Scripture do not frighten us: *I am he who blots out your transgressions.* And: *There is salvation in no one else.* For, testimonies of that kind exclude another God, another Christ, another Savior, and a physician of souls, who, having excluded the true God and the Savior Jesus Christ, promise salvation; but they do not exclude faith, hope, charity, repentance, the sacraments, by which like means and instruments, especially with the help of God, the merit of Christ is applied to us. For otherwise, why is there coherence with these pronouncements: *I am he who blots out your transgressions,* and, *there is salvation in no one else,* on the part of the following texts: *Your faith has saved you* (Luke 7:50). *He will save them, because they take refuge in him* (Ps. 37:40). *When he does what is lawful and right, he shall save his life* (Ezek. 18:27). *He who believes and is baptized will be saved* (Mark 16:16). *He who eats this bread will live forever* (John 6:51). But that is enough on this point. Chytraeus continues.

III.

The gospel teaches that someone doing penance, and hearing the promise, must believe the promise, and believe that sins not only for others, Peter and Paul, but also for oneself because of Christ are remitted; that one is pleasing to God, is received and heard by God; and that one should approach God with this faith by daily prayer. The Pontiffs contend that it should always be doubted whether we have received the forgiveness of our sins; this doubting clearly contradicts faith and is obviously pagan. These are his words.

Our gospel teaches quite clearly that it is necessary to have faith in the promises of God, and all Catholics teach that they are not to be doubted for any reason. But nowhere in our gospel do we read that the remission of sins is promised to men absolutely by God. But much less do we read that each person should believe with certainty that his sins

have been forgiven, that he is pleasing to God, that he has been accepted and heard by God. And rightly is this not read, because it would destroy other things, which are read in it plainly and very clearly. For, what could be clearer than what the wise man writes in Eccles. 9:1: *The righteous and the wise and their deeds are in the hand of God; and whether it is love or hate man does not know?* Likewise what Job says in chapter 9:21 is evident: *I am blameless; I regard not myself; I loathe my life.* And after that: *I become afraid of all my suffering, for I know you will not hold me innocent.*

Why is it that almost all the divine promises have a condition annexed to them, which no one can know for certain whether or not he has fulfilled as he should? Matt. 19:17: *If you would enter life, keep the commandments.* Luke 14:26: *If anyone comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.* Rom. 8:16: *It is the Spirit himself bearing witness with our spirit that we are children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God and fellow heirs with Christ, provided we suffer with him in order that we may also be glorified with him.* Finally. St. Ambrose, who lived a long time before Gregory (as we said above), in sermon 5 on Psalm 119 said: *He wanted disgrace to be taken away from him, which he suspected he had, either because he thought something evil in his heart, and did not do it, and although removed by repentance, still he suspected lest perhaps his disgrace still remained, and therefore he besought God to take it away from him, since only God knows what he himself, who did it, does not know.*

IV.

Hie *gospel teaches that there is only one atoning sacrifice in the world* (see Heb. 7 and 10/ *Christ was offered up once, to take away sin, etc. The Pontiffs teach that Christ is offered to God the Father daily by priests in the sacrifice of the Mass, etc.*

The gospel indeed teaches that there is only one atoning sacrifice in the world, namely, that which was offered once on the cross; Catholics do not deny this. But the gospel nowhere teaches that that one sacrifice cannot be repeated daily in a mysterious way by the same supreme Pontiff Christ through the hands of priests, and Catholics do affirm this. And they are not the only ones to affirm it, who lived after the time of Gregory, but absolutely all the Fathers, even those who preceded Gregory by many centuries. Listen, in the name of the others, what Augustine said in letter 23 to Boniface: *Was not Christ immolated once in himself? Nevertheless, in the sacrament he is immolated not only on all the solemnities of Easter, but every day for the people.*

V.

The gospel teaches that sins are not only external actions contrary to the law of God, but also doubts about God, carnal self-indulgence, insolence, and the concupiscence natural to us and remaining in the re-born (see Rom. 7). *The Pontiffs deny that these evils remaining in the re-born are sins in conflict with the law of God.*

Nowhere do the Pontiffs, that is, Catholics teach that only external actions are sins,

but you are permitted to lie, since you learned that from you father, who does not stand in the truth. Then of course doubts about the faith, carnal self-indulgence, insolence and concupiscence, if they are voluntary—concerning these things we have no doubt that they are sins. But if they are involuntary, such as were the desires of the flesh against the spirit, which Paul experienced, although he did not consent to them, concerning such things we have constantly denied that they are sins. And we are not debating with you about some Pauline words, as if the words of Paul seem to be true to you, and false to us, but we are debating about the interpretation of those words. And you should not take it ill if we prefer the whole chorus of the saints to you new men. For, Augustine says this in book 1, chapter 13 against the two letters of the Pelagians: *But concerning that concupiscence of the flesh of which they speak, I believe that they are deceived, or that they deceive; for with this even he that is baptized must struggle with a pious mind, however carefully he presses forward, and is led by the Spirit of God. But although this is called sin, it is certainly so called not because it is sin, but because it is made by sin, as a writing is said to be some one's hand because the hand has written it.*

VI.

Scripture teaches that man in this weakness of nature can in no way keep the law of God, and be free of all sin (Rom. 8). *The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God; for it does not obey the law of God, and it is not even capable of it. The Pontiffs contend that a man can keep the law, and that he can be justified by this fulfillment of the law and so merit eternal life.*

The Pontiffs do not say, that is, the sons of the Catholic Church, that man in this weakness of nature is free of all sin. For we acknowledge and proclaim to be true what James says at the beginning of his letter: *If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves.* But since these daily sins do not take away the state of grace, they are not so much against the law as beside the law of God, since for the remission of such offenses *let every one who is godly offer prayer to thee at the proper time* (Ps. 32:6), and all the justified sons of God and saints are taught to say daily: *Forgive us our trespasses* (Matt. 6:12). We do this because we are not afraid to say that a man justified by the grace of God can, with the help of the same grace, both keep the law and by that fulfillment merit eternal life. For we know who said: *And his commandments are not burdensome* (1 John 5:3). And who also said: *Call the laborers and pay them their wages* (Matt. 20:8). And again: *Come, O blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you, etc. For I was hungry, and you gave me food to eat.*

Therefore Augustine in chapter 16 of his book on grace and free will said: *It is certain that we can keep the commandments, if we will to do it, but because the will is prepared by God, we must ask him for the will to do what is sufficient, so that by willing it we may be able to do it.* And in chapter 10 of his book on the spirit and the letter: *Therefore grace is given, not because we have fulfilled the law, but in order that we may be able to fulfill the law.* And that word of the Apostle does not move us: *The mind that is set on the flesh is hostile to God.* For, the same apostle had said before in Rom. 7:27: *So then, I of myself*

serve the law of God with my mind, but with my flesh I serve the law of sin.

VII.

The gospel teaches that good works are only those which have been commanded by God, etc. according to the rule which I give to you; do only this for the Lord—do not add to it, do not take away from it. But the Pontiffs have overloaded the Church with traditions, etc.

Now you have repeated these things a thousand times, and we have refuted them. But what you say is false, namely, that in the gospel only those things are said to be good works, which God commands. For where, I ask, did God command virginity? Does not Paul say, *Now concerning virgins I have no command of the Lord* (1 Cor. 7:25)? And still in the same place he says it is a good work to remain a virgin: *Therefore,* he said, *he who marries his virgin does well; and he who refrains from marriage will do better.*

And this rule does not help you very much: What I command you, do only this for the Lord. For in that place God prohibits nothing other than that we do not corrupt his precepts; he wants us to observe them completely, and not to move away from them either to the right or to the left. Therefore St. Augustine in chapter 30 of his book on holy virginity, when distinguishing precepts from counsels said: *For not as, You shall not commit adultery, You shall not kill, can it so be said, You shall not wed. The former are demanded, the latter are offered. If the latter are done, they are praised: unless the former are done, they are condemned. In the former the Lord commands us what is due; but in the latter, if you shall have spent any thing more, on his return He will repay you.*

VIII.

The gospel teaches that both parts of the sacrament or the Lord's Supper should be administered to all Christians; and indeed concerning the chalice he said expressly: Drink of this all of you... But the Pontiffs decree and define contrary to this.

Up to the present time we do not see that place in the gospel where we are taught that both parts of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper must be administered to all Christians. For the Lord does not say about the chalice: Drink of this all Christians, but, Drink of this all of you; but who those all were Mark explained when he added: *And they all drank of it.* However, not all Christians drank, but only the apostles, who alone then were eating with the Lord.

IX.

The gospel teaches that true repentance or conversion to God is deep sorrow concerning one's sins, and faith believing that one's sins will certainly be forgiven because of Christ, etc. The Pontiffs, on the contrary, although they include contrition among the parts of repentance, still pretend that this remission of sins is merited. And they add an auricular confession, which is not commanded by God; and satisfaction, or undue works, by which satisfaction is made for the eternal punishment of sins, and they imagine that these

punishments can be taken away by money. This whole doctrine about the merit of the Son of God, who alone satisfied for our sins, is a blasphemy.

Here I see that nothing is proved, no testimonies from the gospel are provided, and only inane words mixed with lies are uttered. For what you say about conversion, and deep sorrow of the heart you could have omitted. For we really require conversion, and deep sorrow of the heart in penitents, while you maintain nothing other than I know not what kind of terrors for contrition. What you add about faith believing that our sins are forgiven has already been refuted above. What you say that with the Pontiffs contrition merits the forgiveness of sins is a lie, which was also refuted above. What you also say, that the Pontiffs maintain that temporal penance makes satisfaction for eternal punishments, is likewise a lie. For we do not think that we make satisfaction for eternal punishments, which we do not doubt are remitted for us in justification, but for the temporal punishments, which God requires either here or in purgatory from those who after baptism come for penance and reconciliation. *The punishment,* Augustine said in Tractate 124 on John, *is greater than the fault, lest the fault be considered small, if with it the punishment is also completed.*

Finally, you add that auricular confession is not required, and that satisfaction conflicts with the merit of Christ; you do indeed say this but you do not prove it. But read, if you please, sermon 5 of St. Cyprian on the lapsed, and you will find the necessary confession and satisfaction, and these words are often repeated. Then, that satisfaction is obtained by money (unless perhaps here you suspect some shady business) is nothing other among Catholics than one form of satisfaction that can be substituted, in the judgment of the priest, for another, such as almsgiving for fasting. Let us move on to the next point.

X.

The gospel teaches that marriage is granted and free for all men, lay persons and priests; and it says clearly that the prohibition of marriage and of food is a diabolical doctrine. On the other hand, the Pontiffs forbid marriage for a large number of men, priests and monks, and on certain days they command abstinence from certain foods.

But where, I ask, does the gospel teach that marriage is permitted for those who have a vow of continence? Perhaps it is in Heb. 13:4 where we read: *Let marriage be held in honor among all."* Moreover, if "among all" includes absolutely all men, marriage will also be honorable between father and daughter, mother and son, brother and sister; of if this does not please you, it will also not be pleasing that marriage should be said to be honorable between a monk and a nun, and between other men for whom, because of a vow, it is not permitted to enter into marriage. For, the Apostle desires only this, that we honor marriage in all those joined together properly and legitimately. But it remains for you to prove that they are properly and legitimately married who vowed to God perpetual continence.

Listen to what Chrysostom wrote in letter 6 to the monk Theodore, who wanted to marry or perhaps already had married: *Marriage is honorable,* he said, *but it is not fitting for you to enjoy the privileges of marriage. Although you frequently call this a marriage,*

still I think it is worse than adultery. Concerning the text of the Apostle in 1 Tim. 4:3, *those who forbid marriage, etc.,* see what we said above in chapter 21 near the end.

XI.

The gospel teaches that there is a solid foundation upon which the Church has been built, namely, our Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor. 3:11; Acts 4:11; Matt. 16:18). *Augustine thus interprets "on this rock," which you know, saying: You are the Christ, the Son of the living God, that is, I will build my Church on myself, the Son of the living God; I will build you on me, not me on you. On the contrary, the Pontiff says that the whole Church of the Christian world is built on the rock of the Roman Church and the ordinary succession of the Pontiffs.*

But Paul, I believe, is not contradicting himself, when he says in Eph. 2:20 that *we are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets.* And there is no conflict in what Paul says in 1 Cor. 3:11, *there is no foundation of the Church but Christ,* with what John says in Rev. 21:14 that *the twelve apostles are the twelve foundations of the Church.*

For, Paul in 1 Cor. 3 is talking about the primary foundation. The same Paul in Eph. 2 and John in Rev. 21 are referring to the secondary foundations. Augustine also speaks about such a foundation in the Psalm against the party of Donatus, where he says: *Couni the priests who have occupied the chair of Peter. That is the rock over which the proua gates of hell have not prevailed. But on this matter enough has been said above in book 1, chapter 10 on the Pontiff.*

XII.

The gospel teaches that no apostle or bishop, or other minister of the gospel, is superior to another, and has more power and domination in what pertains to the ministry. But it says that all ministers obtain equal power of teaching the gospel, administering the sacraments, binding evildoers, and absolving those who are repentant, as the Scriptures clearly teach. In Luke 22:26, 1 Cor. 3:4, John 20:21-23, Matt. 18 the keys of the kingdom of heaven are handed over equally to all the apostles. On the contrary, the Roman Pontiff claims that he has supreme power over all other bishops, and the whole Church, and also that he has by divine right both the spiritual and the political swords, etc.

Where the gospel teaches that one bishop or minister does not have greater power than another, until now I have not been able to find that text; for, the texts that you cite clearly signify the opposite. Surely in Luke 22:26 the Lord exhorts his followers to be humble, and he prohibits a regal and tyrannical rule for those who are presiding over the Church. In the meantime, however, he says that among the apostles one is greater, and indeed that he is the leader of the others. For he says: *Let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader* (Greek: ἡγουμενος, that is, leader) *as one who serves.* But does not the Apostle in 1 Cor. 3:6, where he says that he planted, and that Apollos watered, and again, like a master builder laid the foundation, but others are building on i(quite clearly signify that he is greater than Apollos and his other helpers?

Then in John 20:21 it is said to all the apostles: *Behold, I am sending you,* and, *whose sins you shall forgive, etc.* Nevertheless in chapter 21 the apostles and all the other faithful are made subject to St. Peter, like sheep to their shepherd, since the Lord says to Peter alone in the presence of the other apostles: *Feed my sheep.* Finally, even if in Matt. 18:18 it is said to all the apostles: *Whatever you bind, etc.,* still it is said to Peter alone in Matt. 16:19, *I will give you the keys of the kingdom, etc.,* and doubtless the Lord would not promise anything to him singularly, unless he also wanted to show him something singular. But we said many things about this above in book 1, chapters 12,13 and 14.

To your objections concerning the two swords against the Bull of Boniface VIII, where you also ridicule the arguments of the Pontiff, I will give this one response in this place, namely, that all those arguments were taken from St. Bernard, whom Melanchthon, Calvin, and others who think like you, are accustomed to call a holy man, and to say it more than once. See books 2 and 4 on Consideration, or if it pleases you, see what we discussed concerning this very matter in the last book on the Pontiff. But these responses concerning your antithesis are sufficient in this place.

Now it will be demonstrated briefly that this vision itself of John is very well suited for Luther and Lutherans. For, first of all, it is clear that Luther can be signified by the star that fell from heaven to earth; since he from being a monk became a layman; from a celibate a married man; from a pauper a rich man, and he exchanged a sober and meager diet for sumptuous dinners and banquets. For what is this other than to fall from a heavenly way of life to a worldly way?

Then concerning the smoke from the bottomless pit, which is the result of his activity, is obvious to all except those who are blind and stupid. Indeed before Luther defected from the Catholic Church, almost the whole West was of the same faith and religion; wherever someone went, he immediately recognized his brothers, for all were in the light. But after the case of Luther such smoke of error, of sects, of schisms, arose that now in the same province, indeed in the same city or house one does not recognize another.

This smoke also (as is said in Revelation) darkened the sun and the air. For, both we and the adversaries explain Christ through the sun, and the Scriptures through the air, though which in this life in a certain way we breathe. Transylvania and the neighboring regions, where the divinity of Christ is openly denied, testify how vehemently that smoke has obscured Christ. Germany also is a witness to this, since there the Anabaptists openly, the Ubiquitists obscurely deny the humanity of Christ. And surely there were of old many heretics, who similarly opposed Christ, but none of them more impudently than the contemporary heretics. For, not only do many of them deny that Christ is God, but they also add that he cannot be invoked, and that he does not know what we are doing. It is a horror to hear, or to read, with what great temerity there is an argument about the mysteries of Christ.

What can be said clearer than what Paul says in 1 Cor. 7:25: *Concerning virgins I have no command of the Lord, but I give my opinion!*

And nevertheless all contemporary heretics constantly deny that there is any counsel of virginity, and that Paul in this place is not giving counsel to embrace virginity, but rather that men want to abstain from it. What can be said more clearly than this word of

the Lord: *This is my body?* And nevertheless today there is nothing more obscure. What shall I say about the Transylvanians, who in their commentaries so pervert the gospel of John, which certainly was written against Cherinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, that they then try to prove from it that Christ is not God?

Let us go now to the locusts, which come out of the smoke of the pit. Chytraeus by the locusts understands the bishops, clerics and monks, but he explains it badly; for also before the times of Gregory there were bishops, priests and monks in the Church; and still up to that time those admirable locusts had not appeared. But most properly eveiything that John says about the locusts applies perfectly to Lutherans and to the other heretics of this time. For, first of all, the locusts always come in a huge swarm, and they are accustomed to invade a place in troops. Prov. 30:27: *The locusts have no king, and yet all of them march in rank.* Thus Lutherans really do not have one head, because they deny that there should be one head of the Church, nevertheless in a brief space of time they grew to a huge multitude; and this is not surprising, because they opened the door to eveiy human vice. Gluttons flock to them, because there are no required fasts among Lutherans; the incontinent rush to them, because among them all vows of continence are disapproved, and marriage is permitted for monks and also priests, and nuns of every kind; likewise all apostates, because all the cloisters are opened up and converted into palaces. Greedy and ambitious princes join them, because ecclesiastical properties and persons become subject to their authority; the idle and the enemies of good works, because among them faith alone suffices, and good works are not necessary. Finally, all the depraved and wicked, because among them the necessity of confessing one's sins has been abolished, and rendering an account to one's own pastor, which especially is accustomed to put a curb on sinners. For these reasons, therefore, the locusts are greatly multiplied.

However, these locusts are described wonderfully by St. John. For, they are said to have a human face, even also like a woman, the tail of scorpions, the body of locusts; likewise on their heads what looked like crowns of gold; they have lions' teeth, and scales like iron breastplates; finally, in appearance the locusts were like horses arrayed for battle, and the noise of their wings was like the noise of many chariots with horses rushing into battle. They have as king over them the angel of the bottomless pit, who is called the Exterminator. The alluring face signifies the beginning of the preaching, which always begins from the gospel, for they promise that they will not say anything unless it is the pure word of God. Thus they easily attract the simple minded. The tail of the scorpion signifies the poisonous and lethal final result, because after they have proposed the word of God, they corrupt it with a perverse interpretation, and in this way, as it were with a twist of the tail, they cause a sting and inject a deadly poison. The body of the locust, which is almost nothing other than a belly (for the locust is a big-bellied animal, and so it cannot properly either walk or fly, but it raises itself into the air by jumping, and immediately it falls back to earth), signifies that the contemporary heretics are men addicted to the stomach, enemies of fasting and continence, and therefore that they can neither walk by way of the commandments, nor fly in order to contemplate heavenly realities.

Indeed sometimes they try to lift themselves up, and to correct their habits, but like locusts they immediately fall back to the earth.

An example of this can be the visit to Saxony, for when Luther observed because of the gospel freedom preached by himself, and that all the laws of the Church were abrogated and that the people without restraint were falling into vices, he began a visitation and warned the pastors that they should preach repentance, the fear of God, obedience, good works, etc. But he accomplished nothing; for more on this see Chochlaeus in his report on the life and deeds of Luther for the year 1527.

For a similar reason they try to fly by contemplation, and now they write passim books on the Trinity, on the Incarnation, and on the other mysteries of this kind, but they fall into grave errors, indeed pernicious heresies, as is clear concerning the Ubiquitists, who destroy they whole mystery of the Incarnation and Trinity.

The crowns on the heads of the locusts signify the arrogance and pride, whereby they exalt themselves above all men. There is in existence the book of Luther to the commander George, and in it he says this: *Since the time of the apostles no doctor, no writer, not theologian or lawyer has confirmed, instructed and consoled the consciences of secular officials so extraordinarily and clearly as I have done. By a singular grace of God I know this for certain, since neither Augustine nor Ambrose, who are excellent in this matter, are equal to me in this regard.* What are we to make of this: that not only Luther and Calvin think nothing of a thousand Cyprians and a thousand Augustines, but also every little Lutheran Minister considers all papists to be dolts and blockheads? But those crowns were like gold, that is, they seemed to be gold but they were not gold, because they imagine themselves to be urged by zeal for the honor of God and for charity to say what they say, when however they are far removed from real zeal for God.

The lions' teeth signify the calumnies, whereby continuously, both in writing and in sermons they attack the good reputation of Pontiffs, clerics, monks, and even of the saints, who reign happily with God.

And surely they seem to be nourished by detractions, and they utter so many, which do not and did not exist, and perhaps never will be that they seem to lack completely all sense of conscience. This is sufficiently clear both from others, which are read passim in their books, and from those that shortly before we cited from the Smalkaldic Synod, Illyricus, Tilmann, Calvin and Chytraeus.

The breast arrayed with an iron vest signifies obstinacy; for they are so obdurate, that even if they are fully convinced, still they never give in; and often they prefer to die rather than abandon their obstinacy.

The similitude of the horses, which seem to be prepared for war, signifies audacity and temerity; for they rashly summon all to war, but then afterwards for the most part they offer only lies. Luther in article 25 of the Assertions said: *Come hither all you papists together; gather together all your studies, to see if perhaps you can break this chain.* Almost all the others speak in the same way.

However, the similitude of the rushing chariots signifies the speed, which this new heresy uses in order to occupy various regions; for, in a short space of time it occupied not only many kingdoms in the northern areas, but it also dared to advance all the way to

India, although God did not permit it to be successful there. For that still new and young Church of Christ did not merit such a scourge.

Finally, the angel of the bottomless pit is called the king of those locusts, because although the locusts do not have a visible king, as we said above, still they cannot lack an invisible king, that is, the devil: *For he is king over all the sons of pride* (Job. 41:25). The king of the locusts is said to be the exterminator, because the devil has never so exterminated and devastated the Church by any heresy or persecution as he did through the Lutherans. For the other heresies, for the most part, destroyed one or the other article of faith, but they did not overturn the whole order and discipline of the Church. But the Lutheran heresy, partly by itself and partly by its children—the Anabaptists, Calvinists, Trinitarians, Libertines, destroyed completely all the goods of the Church in those places where it was able to take root. For, it removed from God the Trinity through the new Samosatians, the divinity of Christ by the same, and the humanity by the Anabaptists. From the angels and saints they removed all devotion and invocation, from purgatory the suffrages of the living, indeed they openly exterminated purgatory itself. From the Church, which is on earth, it took away many books of divine Scripture, almost all the sacraments, all traditions, the priesthood, sacrifice, vows, fasts, feast days, temples, altars, relics, crosses, images, all the monuments of piety. Likewise it exterminated entirely ecclesiastical laws, discipline, and the whole order of the Church.

But perhaps it spared hell, lest it do injury to their own king, the angel of the bottomless pit. But it is not so; for many Lutherans also deny the true and local hell, as we demonstrated above in the dispute about the descent of Christ into the underworld. Therefore truly this heresy can be said to be an exterminator, and worthy of the leader who is called in Hebrew in Greek ἀπολλύων, and in Latin *exterminans.* And surely it would not be surprising, if the Lutherans were to admire this destruction, unless they have been completely blinded by the smoke we spoke about above.

But there is one consolation in all these evils, that is, that the locusts (as John says) do not harm the plants and the green trees, but only men, who do not have the sign of the living God. For since this heresy is wholly carnal, it cannot easily deceive good men and those in whose souls religion and piety are strong and flourishing. Thus we see that it has rarely or never happened that anyone defected from the Church to the Lutherans, unless he had previously begun to live a corrupt and evil life among Catholics.

CHAPTER XXIV

THE ARGUMENTS OF CALVIN AND ILLYRICUS ARE REFUTED. THEY TRY TO PROVE THAT THE POPE IS NO LONGER A BISHOP; THE MYTH ABOUT THE FEMALE POPE JOAN IS ALSO REFUTED.

It remains to be treated what we proposed for the last place, namely, that we show that the Roman Pontiff not only is not the Antichrist, but also that he has not lost his pontificate in any other way. This is necessary, because Calvin and Illyricus, the former by reasoning, the latter by a certain conjecture, try to prove that at this time he is not a true bishop.

Therefore we will begin with Calvin, who says the following in book 4, chapter 7 § 23 and 24 of his Institutes: *Now regarding the Pontiff, what he has that is episcopal I should like to know: the first thing in the office of a bishop is to teach the people the word of God; the second thing next to that is to administer the sacraments; the third thing is to admonish and exhort, and also to correct those who sin, and to support the people in holy discipline. What of those things does he do? Indeed, what does he give the impression of doing? Let them say, therefore, why they want to have a bishop who does not in any way perform the office of a bishop. The reality is not the same with a bishop as it is with a king: for although a king does not carry out what is proper for a king, nevertheless he retains his honor and title. But in judging a bishop the command of Christ is to be kept in mind, which should always hold true in the Church: therefore the Romans solve this problem for me. I deny that their Pontiff is the prince of bishops, because he is not even a bishop.* These are his words.

Unless I am mistaken, this whole argument can be reduced to this brief syllogism. Since this is the difference between a bishop and a king—that a king is a name of power and command, to which is annexed the office of ruling the people; but a Bishop is the name only of the office of preaching the word of God and administering the sacraments. Certainly if neither the king nor the bishop fulfill their office, a king retains his name and dignity, but the bishop loses it. However, the Roman Pontiff does not perform his office in any way, because he does not preach the word nor administer the sacraments to the people. Therefore, the Roman Pontiff has lost his name and dignity, and so he cannot be said to be a bishop.

Now the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 9 chapter 29, col. 500 try to confirm this same point by conjecture and a sign. For they say that an evident sign of the change of the Roman Church into the Babylonian harlot was this, which God willed, that about the time in which this change took place, a certain harlot occupied the pontifical chair; she was called Pope John VIII.

They offer some proof for this. First, from the authors Platina, Martin Polonus, Sigebertus and Mariano Scotus. Secondly, from vestiges of a thing, which have survived until our time, namely, from a certain porphyritic chair perforated within, which remained in the palace of St. John Lateran, whose use they say was instituted after that disgrace was detected, in order to examine, that is, whether the recently created Pontiff was a male or not. Likewise, from a certain statue of a woman with a boy, which until our time has

remained in place, where it is said John VIII gave birth to a child. Finally, from the fact that the Roman Pontiffs, when they go from the Vatican to the Lateran, are accustomed to avoid that place, where that woman is said to have given birth, as a denial of the fact; for otherwise it is the most direct route. Now it is not difficult to solve these objections.

First of all we will respond to Calvin: either Calvin is speaking about the meaning of the name, or about the matter itself, when he says that bishop is the name of an office, and king is the name of a dignity. If he is speaking about the meaning of the name, he is clearly deceived; for, as bishop is said from έπισκοπειν, that is, from considering or overseeing, and signifies the office of overseeing, so also king is said from ruling, and signifies the office of ruling. And just as king is the name of a magistrate, so επίσκοπος also among Gentiles was the name of a magistrate, namely, a praetor, as is clear from Aristophanes in his play about birds; and what is more, the same name of shepherd in the divine writings is attributed to bishop and king, as is clear in Eph. 4 and Isa. 44.

But if he is speaking about the matter itself, he is deceived no less; for, as the royal authority is not a simple office of judging, as is the judgment of others, but a true power of commanding in political matters, that is, the power of governing men subject to them, of commanding and punishing, so also the episcopate is not a simple office of preaching, as it is for many others, who preach and are not pastors, but it is a true ecclesiastical prefecture, that is, the power of governing men in spiritual and divine matters, and therefore of commanding and punishing. About this matter we have said many things above, and we will say more below in the following book; for now it will suffice to mention a few very clear places. The Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 11:34 said: *About the other things I will give directions when I come.* And Heb. 13:17: *Obey your leaders and submit to them.* And 1 Tim. 5:19: *Never admit any charge against an elder except on the evidence of two or three witnesses.*

Add to this also that it is false that the Pontiffs do not exercise the episcopal office. For, they are not held per se to preach, and to administer the sacraments, if they are impeded by some just cause; but it is sufficient, if they provide that all those things are done by others. Otherwise bishops would be obliged to do what is impossible. For, there is no bishop of the smallest diocese, who could by himself preach and administer the sacraments in the whole diocese. Therefore, just as he suffices, if in the place where he cannot be present personally someone else does the preaching, so he fulfills his office, if ineveiy place the preaching is done by others, when he can do it in no place personally. And examples of this from antiquity are not lacking. For, Possidius writes in the life of St. Augustine that St. Valerius, the bishop of Hippo, committed the office of preaching to the priest St. Augustine, because, since he was a Greek, he could not preach to the people in Latin. And in the same place Possidius recounts that in the eastern Church many bishops were accustomed to require their priests to assume the office of preaching, which they personally could not perform. However, we cannot say that either St. Valerius or the others, who per se did not preach the gospel, were not bishops.

To the argument of the Magdeburgenses, I say that it is a fable about the Popessa Joan, which Onuphrius accurately refuted in the Addition to Platina, and he is the first to be convinced that it is a fable, from the testimonies of Greek and Latin authors. The first

one of all who could write about this matter, and who knew it very well, was Anastasios the librarian, who lived at the very time in which it is imagined that that John VIII was Pope, that is, around the year 850; he was present at the creation of many Popes—those who preceded this John or followed. Therefore, he writes that, fifteen days after Leo IV died, immediately by common consent Benedict III was elected Pope, and with these words he indicates there was no feminine John. For, all those who admit this John say that he/she occupied the chair after Leo IV and before Benedict III, and lived as Pope for two years and five months.

Perhaps they will say that Anastasius, in favor of the Pontiff, omitted that John VIII; for, at least he should have said that the chair was vacant after Leo IV for two and a half years, lest he admit a certain error in the Chronology, and an error that could be refuted by eyewitnesses who were living at that time. They respond that there is no error in the Chronology, because those two years of John are added to the years of Leo IV. For Leo IV is said by Anastasius to have reigned for eight years, which are to be accepted in such a way that six years belong to Leo, and the other two are added from the years of the feminine John.

But there is the opposite side; for, not only Anastasius, but also Martinus Polonus, and Platina, and the Magedburgenses, and Bibliander, and others, who say that John VIII reigned for two years, give eight years to Leo; therefore, necessarily there will be an error in the Chronology of Anastasius, if that John is said to have been Pontiff after Leo.

Then not only Anastasius, but also Ado the bishop of Vienne, who lived at the same time, and concerning whom there is no suspicion that he would wish to lie in favor of the Pontiffs, teaches that there was no John between Leo IV and Benedict III; for this is what he says in the Chronology for the year 865: *The Roman Pontiff Gregory died, and in his place Sergius was ordained; upon his death, Leo succeeded. When Leo died, Benedict replaced him in the apostolic See.* And those who say something similar are Rhegino, Lambert, Hermann Contractus, the Abbot Urspergensis, Otto Frisingensis, and all the other historians, and there are many of them, up until Martinus Polonus, who was 400 years after the imaginary John VIII; and he was the first one to mention this John VIII contrary to the faith of all the ancients; but Platina and the other recent authors got their story from him.

Not only the Latins, but also the Greeks, who wrote before Martinus Polonus, like Zonaras, Cedrenus, John Curopalates, and others make, no mention of this prodigious history among the events of that time. However, since they were not favorable to the Roman Pontiff, they would gladly have taken the occasion of ridiculing the Latins in this matter, if they could have done it. So how credible is it, that Martinus Polonus, who lived in the year 1250, had a better knowledge of the things that took place in 850, than all the other historians, who lived in the year 800, or 900, or 1000?

But what the Magdeburgenses say, namely, that Sigebert and Mariano Scotus, who preceded Martinus Polonus, placed the feminine John in their Chronicles, is false. For although in the writings of Sigebert and Mariano Scotus the feminine John or Joan is found, nevertheless in the more ancient manuscripts he/she is not found, and it is quite certain that the works of those authors have been corrupted. There still exists in the

monastery of Gemblacensis, where Sigebert was a monk, a very ancient manuscripζ which is thought to be the autograph of Sigebert himself, and in it there is no mention of a feminine John. John Molanus, a professor at Louvain who is still living, testifies that he saw this manuscript. Similarly, the man who published the works of Albert Krantius, in 1574 in Cologne, testifies that in the most ancient copies of the works of Mariano Scotus the feminine John is not mentioned.

Secondly, Martinus says, and those who follow him, that he studied at Athens. But it is certain that at that time, neither in Athens or anywhere else in Greece was there a college in which to study. For, Synesius writes in his last letter to his brother that during his time in Athens there was nothing except the name of the Academy; and Synesius lived shortly after the time of Basil and Nazianzen. Also Cedrenus and Zonaras write in the life of the Emperor Michael and Theodora, near the end of the reign of Michael, when indeed he reigned alone, since his mother Theodora had been removed, that the schools of literary arts and philosophy had been restored by Barda Caesar, since up until that time, for many years, all studies of wisdom had been so abandoned in Greece that there was not even any trace of them. But it is certain that the rule of Michael alone, after the removal of Theodora, coincided with the time of Nicholas I who succeeded Benedict III, who had succeeded, as they imagine, the female John VIII. Now all the Chronologies, and even Bibliander himself, place the beginning of the reign of Michael in the year of Christ 856, and the pontificate of the female John in the year 854; from this it follows that after the death of this John the study of wisdom began to revive in Greece.

Thirdly, the Magdeburgenses say that that John gave birth to a child on a journey, when she wanted to travel from the Vatican to the Lateran Church; but it is absolutely certain, as Onuphrius demonstrates in his book on the seven Churches, that the Roman Pontiffs did not live in the Vatican, but in the Lateran Palace until the time of Boniface IX, that is, until the year 1390. How, therefore, if she lived in the Lateran, could she want to go from the Vatican to visit the Lateran? Certainly if someone now were to write that the Pontiff went from the Lateran to visit the Vatican, he would be laughed at, since everyone knows that the Pontiff lives in the Vatican.

Fourthly, Martinus says, and all the others, that this John or Joan at a solemn and public religious festival gave birth to a child; but certainly it is not probable that a woman already pregnant for so many months would want to do such a thing, when there was the greatest danger that it would be detected.

Fifthly, the same point is proved from the letter of Leo IX, a very important Pontiff, to Michael, the bishop of Constantinople. In chapter 23 Pope Leo writes that there is a constant report that many eunuchs have occupied the patriarchate of Constantinople, and that among those a woman secretly crept in and was patriarch. Now Leo IX would never have raised this objection to the Greeks, if such a thing shortly before had happened to the Roman See. Indeed, perhaps from this was born the fable about the female John. For, since there was a rumor that a certain woman was the bishop of Constantinople, and then gradually, after the name of Constantinople was lost, there remained a rumor and opinion about a female Pontiff of the whole Church; so some out of hatred of the Roman Church began to say that a woman was the Roman Pontiff; and it is probable that during the time

of Martinus this rumor has its beginning. Certainly Martinus Polonus, who was the first one to write about this, refers to no author, but simply says that it happened; therefore he got this only from an uncertain rumor.

And it should not seem to be surprising, if someone out of hatred for the Roman Church started this rumor, since there was a report of a female bishop in Constantinople, and given the severe conflicts of the time between imperial and ecclesiastical men. For, even now we see that the Magdeburgenses invent even more incredible things. For since Martinus wrote only that this English woman was from Mainz, and did not add anything about her parents, and her real name or any other details, the Magdeburgenses added that the father of this woman was an English priest, and she was initially called Gilberta and also raised like a man in the monastery of Fulda, and wrote books on magic. All of these things are figments of the imagination without any evidence and without any solid reasons. Add to this that Martinus Polonus seems to have been a very simple man, for he wrote down many other fables, as if they were proved historical realities.

But their objections concerning the perforated chair, the statue of the woman, and avoiding a street are answered easily. For, as is clear from book 1, section 2 of the book of sacred ceremonies, there were three stone chairs in the Lateran Basilica, in which the new Pontiff sat at the time of his coronation. The first seat was before the entrance to the temple, and it was common and simple; the new Pontiff was led first to this chair, and he sat in it for a short space of time, so that by that ceremony it was signified that he ascended from a humble place to a very high place. For, while raising him from there they sang the following from 1 Sam. 2:8: *He raises up the poor from the dust; he lifts the needy from the ash heap, to make them sit with princes and inherit a seat of honor.* And this is the reason why it was called the dung seat. The second seat was porphyritic, inside the palace itself, and he sat there secondly as a sign of possession, and while sitting there he received the keys of the Church of the Lateran Palace. The third seat was like the second, and located not far from it; and after sitting there for a short time, he handed over the same keys to the one from whom he had received them, perhaps that by this ceremony he was warned about the death by which, after a short time, he would be handing over that power to someone else. Concerning the chair, there was never any mention about examining the sex of the one seated in it.

But that statue of the woman with the boy without doubt it was not of Pope John. For, if the adversaries say that the ancient historians, in favor of the Pontiff, did not want to mention this woman in their books, how probable is it, that the Pontiffs themselves wanted to mention the statue? Then, if the statue were of this John, it would have represented a woman with a new-born child. But that image did not represent a woman, nor did it show a child held in the arms, but it showed rather large boy, several years of age, like a servant walking in front. Therefore, some think that the statue was of a pagan priest prepared for a sacrifice preceded by his servant. Finally, why the Pontiffs avoid that shorter road while traveling to the Lateran, is not because of hatred for some crime, but because that street is very narrow and winding, and therefore unsuitable for the pontifical entourage, which always tended to be quite large. In addition there is the report of Onuphrius that there were some Pontiffs who more than once made use of this street.

BOOK FOUR

On the power of the Roman Pontiff in spiritual matters

CHAPTER I

THE POPE IS THE SUPREME JUDGE IN DECIDING CONTROVERSIES OVER FAITH AND MORALS

We have demonstrated so far, to the best of our ability, that the Roman bishop of the whole Catholic Church is the supreme pastor instituted by Christ and that he never degenerated into Antichrist or in any other way lost this high dignity. Now it is necessary to consider both his spiritual and his temporal power. We will examine the spiritual power in this fourth book, and we will, with the help of God, consider his temporal power in the following fifth book, which will be the last one.

Now concerning the spiritual power of the Pontiff, although many things could be treated in particular, still there are four main questions. One is about judging the controversies of faith and morals, namely, whether the Sovereign Pontiff possess that power. The second is about certitude; or, as we are wont to say, about the infallibility of this judgment, that is, whether the Sovereign Pontiff, in judging controversies of faith and morals, can err. The third is about his coactive power of making laws: whether the Sovereign Pontiff not only can judge, and in his judging not err, but also whether he can make laws that bind men in conscience, and force them to believe or to act according as the Sovereign Pontiff has judged. The fourth is about the communication of this power, that is, is the jurisdiction of all the other ecclesiastical officials communicated to them by the Sovereign Pontiff, or is it received immediately from God.

Besides these general questions, some other particular ones are customarily treated, such as, whether the Sovereign Pontiff can call, transfer and dissolve a general council; whether he can confer indulgences; whether he can canonize saints; whether he can approve or disapprove religious orders; whether he can appoint or certainly approve bishops. But all of these questions, and others like them, are not suitable for being handled here. For the first pertains to the debate about councils. The second to the debate about penance. The third about the cult of the saints. The fourth to the debate about vows and the institutions of monks. The fifth pertains to the debate about clerics. With the help of God, we will treat these matters in their proper place.

The first general question about the judgment of controversies will not detain us any longer in this place. For, in the discussion about the Word of God we have already shown that the judge of controversies is not the Scripture, nor secular princes, nor private men, no matter how good and learned they may be, but ecclesiastical prelates. But in the debate about the councils it is to be demonstrated that both general and particular councils do have the right of judgment over controversies of religion, but that judgment is only then firm and ratified when the confirmation of the Sovereign Pontiff has been given to them;

therefore the final judgment is in the hands of the Sovereign Pontiff.

Then in this debate about the Pontiff, since we show that the Sovereign Pontiff is the head and pastor of the whole Church, what are we showing other than that he is the supreme judge in the Church? For, either no one should be the judge among men, or he should be who presides over the others. And I do not think that has ever been revoked in controversy.

Finally, this point will become clear in the following question. For, if we can demonstrate that the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff is certain and infallible, it will also really be proved that the same Sovereign Pontiff is the judge of the Church. For, to what end did God confer on the apostolic See the infallibility of judgment, unless he attributed to the same See supreme power in judgment. Nevertheless, to show that we are saying something positive here, we will quote, if you please, some testimonies from the law, from the gospel and from the Fathers. In Deut. 17:8 there is a very clear testimony that doubts arising about religion are to be referred to the Sovereign Pontiff for judgment: *If any case arises,* Moses said, *requiring decision between one kind of homicide and another, one kind of legal right and another, one kind of assault and another, any case within your towns which is too difficult for you, then you shall arise and go up to the place which the Lord your God will choose, and coming to the Levitical priests, and to the judge who is in office in those days, you shall consult them, and they shall declare to you the decision.* In this place it is to be observed that two persons are distinguished—the priest and the judge, that is, pontiff and prince. Giving the decision pertains to the priest, and the execution of it belong to the political judge. This is explained in the following words: *The man who acts presumptuously, by not obeying the priest who stands to minister there before the Lord your God, by the sentence of the judge shall die.*

In the gospel nothing can be said clearer than what the Lord says to Peter in the presence of the other apostles: *Simon son of John feed my sheep.* For, he is speaking to Peter alone, and he hands over to him all his sheep to be shepherded, so that not even the apostles are excluded. But there can be no doubt that among the tasks of a shepherd an important one is to distinguish good pastures from bad ones.

Therefore St. Jerome, a very learned man, in the question about the three hypostases, not sufficiently trusting his own erudition, nor the opinion of the eastern bishops, nor even the authority of the Patriarch of Antioch Paulinus, his own bishop, wrote to Pope Damasus: *From the shepherd,* he said, *I am asking for the protection of a sheep. Decide this, if you please, and I will not be afraid to affirm three hypostases if you order it.*

Theodoretus also, a very learned man among the Greeks, wrote in these words to Leo I: *If Paul, herald of the truth and trumpet of the Holy Spirit, ran to the great Peter, so that he might bring an answer from him to those in Antioch who were arguing about the requirements of the Jewish Law, much more we who are in a low position and puny run to your apostolic See, that we may receive from you the medicine for the ulcers of our Churches.* Prosper in the Chronicle for the year 420 said: *The council held in Carthage of 216 bishops sent the synod decrees to the Pontiff Zozimus; after he examined them, the Pelagian heresy was condemned throughout the whole world.* These are his words. Therefore the whole world acknowledged the final judgment in the matter nowhere else

but in the decision of the Roman Pontiff.

St. Gregory, who in the judgment of all was a very humble man, and never claimed anything for himself but what was proper, in a letter to all the bishops of Gaul, which is number 52 in book 4, says this: *But if some dispute, and may the divine power prevent such a thing, arises concerning the nature of the faith, or some business occurs, over which perhaps there is a serious doubt, and because of its importance it requires the judgment of the apostolic See, after having examined the truth carefully, please bring it to our attention; inasmuch as it pertains to us, doubtless it will be settled by a suitable decision.* The holy Pontiffs said this same thing in clear words both before Gregory and after Gregory, and we do not read that they were ever reprehended by anyone concerning this matter. See Innocent I in his letter to the council of Carthage, Leo I to Anastasius in Thessalonica, Gelasius I to bishop Dardanus, Nicholas I in the letter to the Emperor Michael, and Innocent III in the letter to the bishop of Arles, where there is the chapter on Baptism and its effect.

CHAPTER II

A QUESTION IS ASKED: IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE POPE CERTAIN?

Therefore, as we come now to the second question, first of all it is necessary to know that the Pontiff can be considered in four ways. In one way, as he is a particular person, or a particular doctor. Secondly, as the Pontiff, but alone. Thirdly, as the Pontiff, but joined together with his usual group of advisers. Fourthly, as Pontiff, but together with a general council.

Secondly, it should be observed that two questions can be asked about the Pontiff, after having considered these four modes, when the question is raised whether he can err. First, whether he himself can be a heretic. Secondly, whether he can teach heresy. Finally, it should be noted in the third place that the decisions and decrees of the Pontiffs sometimes deal with universal matters, which are proposed to the whole Church, such as decrees on the faith and general precepts of morals; sometimes they concern particular matters, which pertain to a few people, such as are almost all controversies of fact, as whether this man should be promoted to an episcopacy, whether he was promoted justly, whether it seems that he should be deposed.

That being the case, all Catholics and heretics agree on two points. First, that the Pontiff can, even as Pontiff and with his group of advisers, or with a general council, err in controversies of particular facts, which depend especially on the information and testimonies of men. Secondly, that the Pontiff as a private doctor can err, even in universal questions of law, both of faith and of morals, and that out of ignorance, as sometimes happens to other doctors.

Then all Catholics agree on two other points, not this time with the heretics, but only among themselves. First, that the Pontiff with a general council cannot err in establishing decrees of faith, or general precepts of morals. Secondly, that the Pontiff alone, or with his special council decreeing something in a doubtful matter can either err or not err, but he is to be heard obediently by all the faithful.

Since these points have been established, there are four different opinions concerning them. The first is that the Pontiff, also as Pontiff, even if he defines something with a general council, can be a heretic personally, and he can teach heresy to others and de facto sometimes such a thing has happened. This is the opinion of all the contemporaiy heretics, and especially of Luther, who in his book on the councils said that there were also errors of the general councils which the Sovereign Pontiff approved; and of Calvin who, in book 4, chapter 7 § 28, says that at times the Pontiff with the whole college of Cardinals has taught manifest heresy, for example that the soul of man is extinguished with the body; but that this is a clear lie we will show later. Then in the same book in chapter 9 § 9 he teaches that the Pope can also err with a general council.

The second opinion is that the Pontiff, even as Pontiff, can be a heretic, and teach heresy, if he defines something without a general council, and actually this has sometimes happened. Nilus follows this opinion and defends it in his book against the primacy of the Pope; some Parisians have followed this same opinion, like Gerson and Alma in the book

on the power of the Church, and also Alphonse de Castro in book 1, chapter 2 against the heretics; all of these place the infallibility of judgment in matters of faith, not in the Pontiff, but in the Church, or only in a general council.

The third opinion is to the other extreme, namely, that the Pontiff can in no way be a heretic, nor can he publicly teach heresy, even if he defines something alone. Thus Albert Pighius in book 4, chapter 8 on the ecclesiastical hierarchy.

The fourth opinion is in a certain way in the middle. It says that the Pontiff, whether he can be a heretic or not, cannot in any way define something heretical that is to be believed by the whole Church; this is a very common opinion of almost all Catholics, like St. Thomas II-II, q. 1, a. 10, Thomas Waldenses in book 2, chapters 47 and 48 on the doctrine of the faith, John de Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 109ff. in his Summa, John Driedonis in book 4, chapter 3, part 3, on Church dogma, Cajetan in chapter 9 of his small work on the power of the Pope and Councils, Hosius in book 2 against Brentius, John Eck in book 1, chapter 18 on the primacy of Peter, John of Louvain in chapter 11 of his book on the perpetual Catholic protection of Peter, Peter a Soto in part 1, chapters 83 to 85 in his Apology, and Melchior Cano in book 6, chapter 7 on Theological Places.

However, these authors seem in some way to disagree among themselves, because some of them say that the Pontiff cannot err, if he proceeds opportunely and listens to the counsel of other pastors. Others say that the Pontiff, even alone, can in no way err. But really they do not disagree among themselves. For, the later ones do not want to deny that the Pontiff is bound to proceed opportunely and to consult learned men, but they want to say only that the infallibility itself is not in the council of consultors or in the council of bishops, but only in the Pontiff. Just as, on the other hand, the prior authors do not want to place the infallibility in the councils, but in the Pontiff alone; but they want to explain that the Pontiff must do what he can, by consulting learned men and experts in the matter under consideration. But if someone were to ask: Can the Pontiff err, if he were to define something rashly? Doubtless all the cited authors would respond that it could not happen that the Pontiff would define something rashly; for the one who promised the end, doubtless also promised the means which are necessary to obtain that end. But it would help very little to know that a Pontiff is not going to err when he does not define rashly, unless we also know that divine providence will not allow him to define something rashly.

Of these four opinions the first one is heretical; we do not dare to say that the second one properly is heretical, for we still see that those who hold that opinion are tolerated by the Church. However, it does seem to be very proximate to error and heresy, so that it could deservedly be declared to be heretical by a judgment of the Church. The third opinion is probable, but not certain; the fourth opinion is very certain and should be affiimed, and in order that it might be understood more easily and confirmed, we will now establish a few propositions.

CHAPTER III

THE FIRST PROPOSITION IS ESTABLISHED CONCERNING THE INFALLIBLE JUDGMENT OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF

Therefore, the first proposition is this: When the Sovereign Pontiff teaches the whole Church in matters pertaining to the faith he can in no way err. This is contrary to the first and second opinions and in favor of the fourth; and it is proved first of all from the promise of the Lord in Luke 22:31-32: *Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.* This passage is usually explained in three ways. The first explanation is of some Parisians mentioned above, that the Lord here was praying for the whole Church, or for Peter, as he took the place of the whole Church; and he asked for this—that the faith of the Catholic Church will never fail. This explanation, if it is understood in such wise that it says immediately that he prayed for the head of the Church, and consequently for the whole body, which is represented by the head, is true enough; but they do not understand it in this way; for they want it to mean that he prayer only for the Church.

This explanation is false. First, because the Lord designated only one person, saying twice: *Simon, Simon,* and adding each time the pronoun of the second person, *for you (te), your faith, and you, your brothers.* To what purpose did he say this, unless it was for us to understand that something special was being asked by Christ for Peter? Secondly, because the Lord began to speak in the plural: *Satan demanded to have you (yos}}* then immediately he changed the form of speaking, and says: *But I have prayed for you (te).* Why did he not say for you *(yobis)* as he did in the beginning? Certainly, if he was speaking about the whole Church, he would have spoken more correctly by saying "I have prayer for you *(yobi^.* Thirdly, the Lord prays for him, to whom he says: *And when you (tu)* have turned again; but this certainly cannot pertain to the whole Church, unless we want to say that the whole Church sometime will be perverted, so that afterwards it can again be converted. Fourthly, he prays for him, to whom he says: *Strengthen your brethren;* but the Church does not have brethren whom it must or can confirm. For who, I ask, can imagine brethren of the whole Church? Are not all the faithful her sons?

The second explanation is of those who are living now and who teach that the Lord prayed in this place for the perseverance of Peter alone in the grace of God until the end. But this is not right first of all, because the Lord prayed shortly thereafter for the perseverance of all the apostles, indeed also of all the elect in John 17:11: *Holy Father, keep them in thy name, which thou hast given me;* therefore there was no reason why he should pray twice for the perseverance of Peter. Secondly, because doubtless here the Lord obtained something special for Peter, as is clear from the designation of a certain person: but perseverance in grace is a common gift of all the elect. Thirdly, because it is certain that the Lord at least indirectly prayed in this place also for the other apostles; for he said before as the reason for his prayer: *Satan demanded to have you (yos)* and afterwards he added as the effect: *Strengthen your brethren;* therefore the Lord was not asking for the

perseverance alone of Peter, but for some gift to be given to Peter on their behalf. Fourthly, the gift obtained for Peter in this place, pertains also to his successors; for, Christ prayed for Peter for the advantage of the Church, but the Church always needs someone by whom it can be strengthened, whose faith cannot fail. For the devil did not seek to sift only those who were faithful then, but absolutely all of them; but certainly the gift of perseverance does not pertain to all Peter's successors. Finally, the Lord did not say, I prayed that your charity might not fail, but your faith; and actually we know that Peter's charity and grace did fail, when he denied the Lord; but we know that his faith never failed.

Therefore, the third explanation is the true one, that the Lord obtained two privileges for Peter. One, that he could never lose the true faith, no matter how much he is tempted by the devil; this is something more than the gift of perseverance. For, he is said to persevere to the end, who, although sometimes he falls, still he recovers, and in the end is found to be faithful. But the Lord obtained for Peter that he could never fall in what pertain to the faith.

A second privilege is that he, as the Pontiff, could never teach anything contraiy to the faith, or, that in his chair there would never be found someone who would teach contrary to the true faith. Of these privileges, the first perhaps is not passed on to others, but the second one without doubt was passed on to his successors.

Concerning the first privilege we have the express testimonies of the ancients. Augustine in chapter 8 of his book on rebuke and grace said: *When he prayed that his faith might not fail, he prayed that he might have in faith a free, strong, unconquerable and persevering* A Chiysostom in homily 83 on Matthew said: *He did not say, you will not deny, but that your faith may not fail. For, it was brought about by his concern and favor that the faith of Peter would never disappear.* Theophylact in comments on Luke 22 said: *Although you are to be shaken, you still have the hidden seeds of faith, even if the invading spirit takes away the leaves; nevertheless the root lives, and your faith will not fail.* There with an elegant similitude he explains that Peter, by denying Christ, lost the confession of the faith which takes place by the mouth, for the leaves signify the words; but he did not lose the faith, by which in his heart he believed unto justification. Prosper in book 1 on the vocation of the Gentiles explains it in the same way. Moreover, these Fathers, although they do not mention the other privilege, nevertheless they do not deny it, and they cannot deny it, unless they want to contradict several other Fathers.

Therefore, concerning the second privilege we have first of all the testimonies of seven of the ancient and holy Pontiffs. Lucius I, Pope and martyr, in letter 1 to the bishops of Spain and Gaul said: *The Roman Church is apostolic, and the mother of all the Churches, which is proved never to have strayed from the way of the apostolic tradition; she has never been corrupted or succumbed to heretical novelties, according to the promise of the Lord himself, when he said: I have prayed for you, etc.* Felix I in a letter to Benignus, when speaking about the Roman Church said: *As she received in the beginning the rule of Christian faith from her authors, the princes of the apostles of Christ, so she remains untarnished according to the saying: I have prayed for you, etc.*

Leo in sermon 3 on his assumption of the pontificate said: *A special care is received from the Father by the Lord and is properly sought for the faith of Peter, as the status of the others would be more secure, if the mind of the leader was not overcome. In Peter,*

therefore, the fortitude of all is strengthened; and the help of divine grace is so ordered that the constancy, which was given to Peter by Christ, through Peter is conferred on the other apostles. There Leo acknowledges both privileges; the first one when he says: *If the mind of the leader is not overcome;* the second when he adds: *The constancy, which was given to Peter by Christ, through Peter is conferred on the others.* For, the constancy is not conferred on the others, except by expounding the true faith.

Pope Agatho in a letter to the Emperor Constantinus IV, which was read in the 4th session of the Sixth Council, and afterwards in session 8 was approved by all: *This is the rule of the true faith,* he said, *which the apostolic Church of Christ maintained in good times and in bad, and which by the grace of God has never strayed from the apostolic way of tradition; it has never been corrupted or succumbed to heretical novelties, because it was said to Peter: Simon, Simon, behold, Satan, etc. But I have prayed for you, etc. Here the Lord promised that Peter's faith would never fail, and he warned him to strengthen his brethren; it is well-known by all that my pontifical apostolic predecessors have always done this confidently.*

Nicholas I in his letter to Michael said: *The privileges of this See are perpetual, planted and rooted by God; they can be opposed, but they cannot be transferred; they can be attacked, but they cannot be removed. They existed before your command, and they remain to this day, thank God, untarnished, and they will remain after you, and wherever the Christian name is preached, they will not cease to exist.* And after that, showing why he spoke so freely about that, he says: *For also among other things, he through whom these privileges especially have been conferred on us heard the Lord saying to him: When you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.*

Leo IX in a letter to Peter of Antioch said: *To be sure, he is the only one for whom the Lord and Savior said that he prayed that his faith would not fail, saying: I have prayed for you, etc. This reverent and efficacious prayer obtained that until now the faith of Peter has not failed, and it is believed that on his throne it will not fail.*

Innocent III in a letter to the bishop of Arles and which is found in the treatise on Baptism and its effect said: *He understands that the major cases of the Church, especially those concerning the articles of faith, must be referred to the See of Peter; for he knows that the Lord prayed for him that his faith would not fail.* It seems that these pontiffs are to be believed, both because they are saints, and because doubtless they had to know about the authority of their See.

In addition to these Pontiffs, other authors are not lacking who explain this matter in the same way. Theophylact on Luke 21 openly teaches that this privilege was given to Peter, because he was to be the future leader and head of the others, and therefore it was given to all the others who would succeed him in the primacy: *Because I have you,* he said, as the leader of the disciples, strengthen them. For, this is fitting for you, who are, after me, the rock and foundation of the Church.

Peter Chiysologus in a letter to Eutyches, which is found in tome 1 before the Council of Chalcedon: *We urge you,* he said, *reverend brother, that you accept obediently what has been written by the blessed Pope of the Roman city, because blessed Peter, who lives and presides in his own See, presents the true faith to those seeking it.* For, although this author

does not cite the text of the gospel: *I have prayed for you, etc.,* still doubtless he has it in mind, since he so confidently affirms that the truth of the faith is offered by the Roman See to all who are seeking it.

Bernard in letter 190 to Innocent said: *It is necessary that all dangers and scandals in the kingdom of God must be referred to your apostolate, those especially, 'which pertain to the faith. For I think it is especially necessary that the damages to the faith be corrected, where there cannot be a defect of faith. For when was it ever said to any other See: I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail?*

There are some objections against this explanation. First, because the Roman Church did not exist, when Christ promised Peter that his faith would not fail, and the Lord made no mention of the Roman See. Therefore how can it be concluded that the Lord promised something to the Roman See, when he said: *I have prayed for you, etc.*

Secondly, because if this is said to Peter, *I have prayed for you, etc.,* it is said to his successors; therefore also the words, *when you have turned again,* are said to his successors; therefore all Peter's successors must at some time deny Christ and afterwards be converted.

I respond to the first objections that Christ is said to have prayed for the Roman See, because he prayed for Peter and his successors, whose See was to be established in Rome.

To the second objection I say first of all that it is not absurd, if we say, the words "when you have turned again" are not referred to the repentance of Peter, but to the temptations of others, so that the meaning is not: *When you have turned from sin to repentance, strengthen your brethren; bx^you whose faith cannot fail, when you see some wavering and vacillating, when you have turned to them, strengthen them.* For, he had not yet predicted to Peter his fall, but shortly thereafter he will predict it. But it seems absurd, if conversion is preached before the fall, resurrection before the death. I say secondly, if we explain "when you have turned away from your denial," it does not necessarily pertain to the successors of Peter to be converted from a sin of denial, since it necessarily does pertain to them to confirm the brethren. For, to be converted from sin does not pertain to men, except inasmuch as they are private persons, and so it is a personal gift; but to confirm the brethren pertains to a man as the head and leader of others, and so it is handed on to his successors.

Secondly the same conclusion is proved from the promise given to Peter in Matt. 16:18: *On this rock I will build by church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.* For, as we showed above in book 1, chapter 10, Peter as the supreme ruler of the Church literally is the rock and foundation of the Church; and therefore each one of his successors similarly is the rock and foundation of the Church. From this is derived a twofold argument.

First, from the name of rock: for, why is the Pontiff said to be a rock, unless it is by reason of his constancy and solidarity? Certainly if he is a rock, he will not be broken, he will not be moved by every wind of doctrine, that is, he will not err in faith, at least inasmuch as he is a rock, that is, inasmuch as he is Pontiff.

Secondly, from the nature of a foundation supporting a building, which can in no way fall down; for, if the building is such that it cannot fall down, certainly its foundation cannot be disturbed. For, it cannot be understood how the foundation is destroyed, and the house does not fall. Indeed, since the foundation cannot be destroyed, the house cannot fall; for the foundation does not receive its firmness from the house, but the house from the

foundation. All the Fathers explained it in this way, and hence they deduced that Peter and consequently the other Pontiffs cannot err.

Origen in his comments on this place said: *It is manifest, although it is not expressed, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against Peter or against the Church; for, if they prevailed against Peter, on whom the Church was founded, they would also prevail against the Church.*

Chrysostom says concerning this place that only God could accomplish this, namely, that the Church founded on one fisherman and common man, will not fall, while being buffeted by so many storms.

Cyril in the *Catena* of St. Thomas on this place said: *According to this promise, the apostolic Church of Peter will remain free of all seduction and heretical temptation, etc.*

Theodoretus in a letter to the Roman priest Renatus said: *This holy See has the governance of the Churches of the whole world, both because of other reasons and because it has always remained free of the stink of heresy.* There Theodoretus seems to argue in this way: the governance of the whole Church should belong to the See that cannot fail in faith; but we see that only the Roman See has no part in heretical perversity, or ever did have. Therefore, it is manifest that she is the one to whom the governance of the Church has been given.

Jerome in a letter to Damasus on the word "hypostasis," after he had said: *I know that the Church was built on this rock,* added the following: *I beseech that authority be given to me by your letter of either being silent about or speaking about the three hypostases; I do not fear to speak about the three hypostases, if you command it.* There he is saying that he will safely follow the determination of the Pontiff, because he knows that the Church has been built on him, and it cannot happen that the foundation of the Church should fail.

St. Augustine on the Psalm against Donatus says the following: *Number the priests from the chair itself of Peter, in the order of the Fathers; see who succeeded whom; he is the rock, which the proud gates of hell do not disturb.*

Gelasius in the letter to Emperor Anastasius said: *This is what the apostolic See very much protects, that since the glorious confession of the Apostle is the foundation of the world, it is not defiled by any trace of wickedness, by any disease. For if (may God prevent it, and we are confident it cannot happen) some such thing should occur, how would we dare to resist such an error?* Here Gelasius is teaching that the apostolic See cannot err, because, since its preaching and confession is the foundation of the world, if she should err, then the whole world would err.

St. Gregory in book 4, letter 32 to Mauritius demonstrates that it cannot be that the bishop of Constantinople is the universal bishop, and therefore head of the whole Church, because many of the bishops of Constantinople were public heretics, indeed also heresiarchs, like Macedonius and Nestorius; for it seems to follow that the whole Church collapses, if he collapses who is the universal bishop. Likewise, in book 6, letter 37 to Eulogius he said: *Who does not know that the holy Church is founded on the solidity of the prince of the apostles? To him it was said: On this rock I will build my Church.* And again: *And when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren.* Here Gregoiy openly teaches that the firmness of the Church depends on the firmness of Peter; and therefore that it is less

possible for Peter to err then for the Church herself.

Thirdly, it is proved from the words in John *feed my sheep.* For, it was demonstrated above in book 1, chapters 14-16 that by these words the Pontiff was established as the shepherd and teacher of the whole Church. Hence the argument goes like this: the Pontiff is the shepherd and teacher of the whole Church; therefore, the whole Church is bound to hear him and to follow him; therefore, if he errs, the whole Church will err. They will respond that the Church must hear him, if he teaches rightly, otherwise God should be listened to more than men.

But I object to that; for, who will judge whether the Pontiff is teaching correctly or not? For it is not the part of the sheep to judge whether the shepherd errs or not, especially in matters truly doubtful. And Christian sheep do not have another major judge or teacher to whom they can appeal. For, as we showed above in book 2, chapters 13 and 14, from the whole Church one can appeal to the Pontiff, but there is no appeal from him. Necessarily, therefore, the whole Church will err, if the Pontiff errs. Again they will respond: one can recur to a general council.

But I object to that: for, beside the fact that we have shown in the treatise on councils that the Pope is above a council, it is certain that general councils often have erred, when they lacked the approval of the Sovereign Pontiff, as is clear concerning Ephesus II, Ariminum, and others.

They respond that it is possible to recur to a general council at which the Pontiff is also present, for a council with the Pontiff is something greater than the Pontiff alone. But that is not correct; for, first of all, the Lord said to Peter alone: *I have prayed for you, etc.* And: *Feed my sheep;* he did not say these things to Peter and a council. Likewise, he called Peter alone the rock and foundation, not Peter with a council. From this it is apparent that the whole firmness of legitimate councils is from the Pontiff, not partly from the Pontiff, partly from the council. Then, often a general council cannot be assembled, as it could not be done during the first 300 years because of the persecutions of the pagans; and doubtless that state of the Church could have continued until the end of the world; therefore, there must be in the Church also without a general council some judge who cannot err. Finally, what happens if in such a council the Fathers disagree with their présider, that is, a council disagreeing with a present and presiding Sovereign Pontiff? What will happen then? Is there no other remedy? Certainly someone must be the judge. But in that case the council would not be the judge, because when councils disagree with the Pontiff, they can err, and de facto have erred, as we said about Ephesus II and others. The result is, therefore, that the Pope is the judge, and therefore he cannot err.

Fourthly, it is proved from the Old Testament, which was a figure of the New Testament. In Exod. 28 the Lord commands that the Urim and Thummim are to be placed in the breastpiece of the high priest. In Hebrew it is own D'TiR. But it should be observed that there is until now no agreement among Hebrews, nor also among Christians, what those two words mean. Rabbi Salomon says that the name of God H'T was written on the breastplate, and from its glittering the priest knew the divine response, when he was questioned by someone. Arias Montanus in his *Apparatu* teaches that they are two shining stones produced immediately by God and given to Moses. Josephus in book 3, chapter 9

in his Antiquities says that they are the twelve stones on which were written the names of the twelve sons of Israel, which God commanded to be placed in the breastpiece, and in the same place he mixes together many fables. What Augustine writes in question 117 on Exodus is more probable, namely, that these words were written in the middle of the breastpiece, which hung before the breast of the priest.

There is no obstacle in the fact that Jews and Judaizers say that D'rnK does not mean "teaching" but splendors, from the root ΓΙΚ , and D^n does not mean truth, but perfection, from the root D»n. For, more faith should be put in Jerome, who translates it as "teaching," and "truth," and in the LXX translators, who similarly translate it as δήλωσιν and άλήθειαν, rather than in all the Rabbis. And hence it should be said that □'"HK is derived from the root ΠΤ which means "he taught," and from the root which means "he believed."

But why "teaching and truth" were written on the breast of the high priest is explained in Deut. 17:9, where the Lord commands those who have doubts about the understanding of the divine law, that they should go to the Levitical priests and seek an answer from them; and then he adds: *And they shall declare to you the decision.* And so the Lord promised by sign and word that the teaching and the truth would be found in the breast of the high priest; and therefore that he would not err, when he taught the people. Now if this was fitting for the Aaronic priest, certainly it is much more so for the Christian. Therefore, blessed Peter Ravenna, as was said a short time ago, exhorted Eutyches, *that he should give obedient attention to the things which were written by the blessed Pope of the city of Rome, since St. Peter, who lives and presides in his own See, offers the truth of faith to those seeking it.*

Fifthly, it is proved from experience, and that on two levels. For, first of all, it is certain that all the patriarchal Sees failed in faith, so that heretics, and those professing and teaching heresy occupied those chairs, with the exception of the Roman See. In the See of Constantinople the chair was occupied by Macedonius, Nestorius, and Sergius who were heresiarchs. In Alexandria there were the Arians, Gregory and Lucius, Dioscorus a Eutychian, Cyrus a Monothelite, and others. In Antioch Paul Samosate the heresiarch, Peter Graphaeus a Eutychian, Macharius a Monothelite, and others. In Jerusalem John Origenista, and before him Eutyches, Irenaeus and Hilary, who were Arians, occupied the See. Nothing like this can be shown concerning the Roman Church. From this it is apparent that the Lord really did pray for it that its faith would never fail. Hence Ruffinus in his explanation of the Creed said: *In the Church of the city of Rome, no heresy ever had a beginning, and the ancient custom was preserved there.*

The second experience is that the Roman Pontiff, even without a general council, condemned several heresies, like those of Pelagius, Priscillianus, Jovinianus, Vigilantius, and of many others; by that very fact the whole Church considered them to be true heresies, and dreaded them, because they had been condemned by the Roman Pontiff. Therefore this is a sign that the whole Church thinks that the Roman Pontiff cannot err in matters of this kind. See Prosper in the extra book against the Collection, and the Deacon Peter in the book on the grace of Christ to Fulgentius.

CHAPTER IV

ON THE PARTICULAR ROMAN CHURCH

The second proposition: *The Roman Pontiff not only cannot err in faith, but neither can the particular Roman Church.* It is to be observed here that the firmness of the Roman Church in faith must be taken in one sense, and the firmness of the Pontiff in another. For, the Pontiff cannot err in a judicial error, that is, when he judges and defines a question of faith; but the Roman Church, that is, the Roman people and clergy cannot err in a personal error, so that absolutely all err, and there are no faithful in the Roman Church following the Pontiff. For although each one separately can err, still it cannot happen that all err at the same time, and the whole Roman Church becomes apostate.

It is to be observed further that the Roman Church cannot err in the way just explained, and this can be understood in two ways. In one way, that it cannot err, provided that the apostolic See remains in Rome; however that would not be the case if the See were moved elsewhere. In another way, that it simply cannot err or fail, because the apostolic See cannot ever be transferred away from Rome. And according to the first meaning our proposition is true; for the cited authors, like Lucius and Felix, popes and martyrs; Agatho and Nicholas, popes and confessors; likewise Cyril and Ruffinus have asserted that not only the Pontiff, but also the Roman Church cannot err.

Moreover, St. Cyprian in book 1, letter 3 said: *They venture to sail to the chair of Peter, and the principal Church, etc. nor do they think that they are Romans, for whom faithlessness cannot have any reception.* St. Jerome in book 3 of his Apology against Ruffinus said: *But let me tell you that the faith of Rome which was praised by the voice of an Apostle, does not recognize tricks of this kind. A faith which has been guaranteed by the authority of an Apostle cannot be changed though an Angel should announce another gospel than that which he preached.* St. Gregoiy Nazianzen near the middle of the song on his life said: *Old Rome from ancient times has the correct faith, and will always retain it, since it is fitting that the city, which presides over the whole world, should always have the integral faith about God.*

I will also add the testimonies of two Pontiffs which, although they are despised by the heretics, still should be received with honor by Catholics. One is that of Pope Martin V who, in a Bull which he published, with the approval of the Council of Constance, said that those persons are to be considered heretics who think otherwise about the sacraments or the articles of faith, than the Roman Church thinks. The other is that of Pope Sixtus IV, who first of all by the Synod of Complutum, and then also per se condemned the articles of a certain Peter of Oxford; one of these articles said that the Church of the city of Rome can err. And although these words seem to have to be understood precisely by reason of the Pontiff; still, because the Roman Church is not the Pontiff alone, but the Pontiff and the people, therefore when the Fathers or Pontiffs say that the Roman Church cannot err, they want to say this: that in the Roman Church there will always be a bishop teaching in a Catholic way, and a people thinking in a Catholic way.

But according to the second meaning, that the Roman Church cannot fail, it is indeed

a pious and probable opinion; however it is not so certain, that the contrary view could be said to be heretical, or manifestly erroneous, as John Driedo rightly teaches in book 4, chapter 3, part 3 on ecclesiastical dogmas and Scripture. It is clear that it is not absolutely a matter of faith that the apostolic See cannot be separated from the Roman Church, because neither Scripture nor tradition say that the apostolic See is so attached to Rome that it cannot be moved from there. And all the testimonies of Pontiffs and Fathers, who say that the Roman Church cannot err, could be explained to be about the Roman Church as long as the apostolic See remains there, but not absolutely and simply.

Nevertheless, however, pious and very probable is the opinion that the chair of Peter cannot be separated from Rome, and therefore that the Roman Church absolutely cannot err, or fail. This is proved first from the fact that the apostolic See remained in Rome so long, notwithstanding the constant persecutions and occasions for moving. For, there was a very good occasion for transferring the See from Rome to another place during the time of the pagan emperors; for, they took it very ill that the apostolic See was in Rome. And therefore as soon as they heard that a new Pontiff had been elected, they either killed him or sent him into exile. Hence Cyprian, praising the constancy of Pope Cornelius in book 4, letter 2, said this: *How great is the strength in his accepted episcopacy? What strength of soul, what firmness of faith? He sits fearlessly in Rome in the sacerdotal cathedral during the time when the tyrant attacked the priests of God and threatened them with good reports and bad reports.*

Then again there was an occasion of transferring the See during the time of the Goths; for, first of all, at the time of Innocent I, Alaric captured Rome, plundered it and burned it, as Jerome says in his letter to Principia on the death of Marcella. Then during the time of Leo I Genseric again took Rome, and plundered it, as Blondus writes in book 4, Decadis 1, and then, for a certain length of time, Rome remained without any inhabitants. Again at the time of Pope Vigilius, Attila destroyed Rome completely, tore down most of the walls, and burned almost all the houses, and so devastated it that no man or woman remained in it, as the same Blondus writes in book 6, Decadis 1. Finally, during the whole time of the Langobards the Roman Pontiffs were in great miseries, as can be seen in many of the letters of St. Gregory. However, the Roman Pontiffs never considered moving the Roman episcopacy.

The third occasion for transferring the See was during the time of St. Bernard because of the persecution of the Roman citizens themselves. For, the Roman citizens so vexed their Pontiffs for many years that the Pontiffs often were forced to flee from the city, as is clear both from the histories, and from St. Bernard in letter 242 to the people of Rome and letter 243 to the Emperor Conrad.

The fourth occasion was when the Roman Pontiffs remained in France for 70 years. For since they decided to live far from Rome with the whole curia, why, I ask, did they not transfer the See? Why did they not move the Roman episcopacy to Avignon? Therefore, since there were so many occasions for transferring the See, still it remained in Rome for over 1500 years, so it is very probable that it cannot in any way be transferred.

Secondly, this same point can be proved from the fact that God himself ordered that the apostolic See of Peter be located in Rome; and what God commands cannot be

changed by men. But St. Marcellus, Pope and martyr, in his letter to Antioch testifies that God ordered the move; in it he says that Peter, because commanded by the Lord, transferred his Roman See from Antioch. St. Ambrose also testifies to this in his Oration on the tradition of Basilicas; there he recounts that Christ absolutely willed that Peter should stay in Rome, and therefore he said to him fleeing: *I am coming to Rome to be crucified again.* This is a clear sign that God wanted Peter's See to be established in Rome through his death there. What Leo said in his sermon on the birth of the apostles Peter and Paul pertains to this same point: *You introduced into the Roman citadel the trophy of the cross of Christ; where both the honor of the power and the glory of the passion preceded you by divine preordinations.*

Someone will say: by this argument it seems to be proved that it is a matter of faith that the See cannot be transferred from Rome; for, it is of faith that the divine precepts cannot be changed by men. Therefore, if God commands that the See be established in Rome, it seems to be a matter of faith that it cannot be moved elsewhere.

I respond that it does not follow; for, Popes Marcellus and Leo do not define this matter as being of faith, but they narrate it as history. But pontifical narrations are no matters of faith—only their decrees are. Then, what they say, namely, that by a comman· of the Lord Peter transferred his See to Rome can be understood in two ways: in one way that the Lord appearing visibly to Peter commanded him to do this, and then truly by divine precept the See of Peter would be said to be established in Rome; in another way, that Christ did not openly command it, but is said to have commanded it, because Peter did it because of divine inspiration, as all the decrees and precepts of the Church can be said to be divine, which however are changeable.

It can also be said that even if it were certain that Christ commanded Peter to locate his See in Rome, still it does not immediately follow that he ordered that it should be there immovably. Therefore, since it is not certain how Christ ordered Peter to locate his See in Rome, therefore it is not of faith, a divine and immutable precept that the See is to be established in Rome; however, as we have said, it is veiy probable and piously to be believed. And not withstanding that, at the time of Antichrist Rome, it seems, is to become desolated and burned, as is concluded from Rev. 17. For, this will not take place except at the end of the world. And moreover then also the Sovereign Pontiff will be in the same situation, although he will not be in Rome, as happened during the time of Attila, as we said above. It should be added here that Augustine, and many others do not say that Rome is to be understood in that text of the Apocalypse as the city to be burned, but they understand it as the multitude of the wicked, which is the city of the devil.

CHAPTER V

ON DECREES OF MORALS

The third proposition can be this: *Not only can the Sovereign Pontiff not err in decrees of faith, hut also he cannot err in precepts of morals, which are prescribed for the whole Church, and which are concerned with things necessary for salvation, or with things which are per se good or evil.*

We are saying, first of all, that the Pontiff cannot err in those precepts *which are prescribed for the whole Church,* because as we said above, concerning precepts and particular judgments, it is not absurd that the Pontiff may err.

We add, secondly, *which are concerned with things necessary for salvation, or with things which are per se good or evil,* because it is not erroneous to say that the Pontiff in other laws can err, that is, by establishing a superfluous law, or one that is less discrete, etc.

Now we will explain the whole matter with some examples. It cannot happen that the Pontiff would err by prescribing some vice, like usury, or forbidding some virtue, like restitution, because these things are per se good or evil; and it cannot happen that he would err by prescribing something against salvation, like circumcision, or observing the Sabbath, or by forbidding something necessary for salvation, like Baptism or the Eucharist. But that he would command something which is neither good nor bad essentially, nor contrary to salvation but which is useless, or that he should prescribe it under a very severe penalty—it is not absurd to say that this could happen, although it is not the role of subjects to pass judgment on these matters, but simply to obey.

Now the proposition is proved, and first of all, that the Pope cannot err in precepts of morals necessary for salvation, because then the whole Church would be seriously injured, and she would err in necessary matters, which is contrary to the promise of the Lord in John 16:13: *When the Spirit of truth comes, he will guide you into all the truth.* This is to be understood (at the very least) to be about the truth necessary for salvation.

Secondly, because then God would be failing his Church in necessary matters, since he commanded her to follow the Pontiff, and he permits the Pontiff to err in necessary matters. But certainly if God is not lacking in any way concerning necessary matters, how much less regarding his Church?

Now it is proved that the Pontiff cannot err in morals that are per see good or evil. For then the Church could not truly be said to be holy, as it is called in the Apostles' Creed. For, she is said to be holy especially because of the holy profession, as we have shown elsewhere, because indeed she proclaims a holy law and profession, which teaches nothing false, and prescribes nothing evil.

Secondly, because then necessarily she would also err concerning the faith. For, the Catholic faith teaches that every virtue is good, every vice is evil. But if the Pope erred by prescribing vices, or forbidding virtues, that is, by prescribing some

work, which would really be evil, but not manifestly evil, or by forbidding a work of virtue, but not manifestly a work of virtue, the Church would be bound to believe that vices are good and virtues are evil, unless it wanted to sin against conscience. For in doubtful matters the Church is bound to accept the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff, and do what he prescribes, and not to do what he forbids. And lest by chance she should act against conscience, she is bound to believe as good what he prescribes, and evil what he forbids.

CHAPTER VI

ON THE PONTIFF AS HE IS A PARTICULAR PERSON

The fourth proposition: *It is probable, and can piously be believed, that the Sovereign Pontiff not only cannot err as Pontiff, but also that as a particular person he cannot be a heretic, by obstinately believing something false contrary to the faith.* It is proved, first of all, because the sweet disposition of divine providence seems to require it. For, the Pontiff not only should not, but cannot preach heresy, but also should always teach the truth, and doubtless he will do that, since the Lord commanded him to strengthen his brethren, and therefore he added, *I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail,* that is, that at least the preaching of the true faith on your throne will not fail. And how, I ask, will a heretical Pontiff confirm the brethren in the faith, and always preach the true faith? Of course God can extort the profession of the true faith from a heretical heart, as at one time he put words in the mouth of Balaam's ass, but that is something violent, and it is not according to the usual norm of divine providence of arranging all things sweetly.

Secondly, it is proved from what has happened in the past. For, until now no one was a heretic, or certainly it cannot be proved about any Pontiff that he was a heretic. Therefore this is a sign that it cannot happen. For more on this see Pighius.

CHAPTER VII

OBJECTIONS TAKEN FROM REASON ARE REFUTED

Opposing arguments are taken partly from reason, partly from various examples of the Pontiffs. The first reason: Many canons teach that the Pontiff cannot be judged, unless he is found to deviate from the faith; therefore he can deviate from the faith, otherwise those canons would be in vain. The antecedent is clear from the canon "Si papa" dist. 40 from the fifth Council under Symmachus, and from the eighth general Council in session 7, from Anacletus in letter 3, from Eusebius in letter 2, from Innocent III in sermon 2 on the consecration of a Pontiff.

I respond, first of all, that all those canons are speaking about the personal error of a Pontiff, not a judicial one. For, if a Pontiff is a heretic, he will be such only by denying some truth previously defined, but he cannot be a heretic, when he defines something new, forthen he is not thinking contrary to something defined by the Church. The cited canons, however, are speaking expressly about heresy; therefore they are not speaking about a judicial error, but a personal error of the Pontiff. Secondly, I say that those canons do not want to say that the Pontiff also as a private person can err, but only that the Pontiff cannot be judged; because it is not absolutely certain whether or not a Pontiff can be a heretic; therefore for greater caution, they add this condition, unless he should become a heretic.

The second reason: If the Pontiff alone can define dogmas of faith infallibly, then councils are in vain, or certainly they are not necessary.

I respond: that does not follow. For, although there is infallibility in the Pontiff, still he himself should not disregard the human and ordinary means whereby one can arrive at the true knowledge of the question at hand; but the ordinary means is a greater or lesser council, depending on the magnitude or smallness of the matter to be considered; this is evident from the first example of the apostles. For certainly both Peter and Paul could also alone infallibly define any controversy; nevertheless, they summoned together a council in Acts 15.

Then, definitions about the faith depend especially on the apostolic tradition, and the consensus of the Churches. But in order to know the origin of some question, which is the thinking of the whole Church, and which tradition the Churches of Christ observes, there is no better way than if the bishops from all the provinces assemble together in one body, and each one recounts the custom of his Church.

Furthermore: councils are very useful, and often necessary, so that really an end can be put to controversies, and decrees of faith are not only made, but also are preserved, for when there is a general council all the bishops endorse it, and profess that they embrace the decree, and so afterwards will preach it in their Churches. But when there is no general council it is not so easy to put into practice a decree made about the faith, since some claim ignorance of the decree, and others also say that the Pontiff could have erred. But it was necessary to speak about this in another place. See book 1, chapters 10 and 11 on councils.

The third reason: If the judgment of the Pontiff on matters of faith is infallible, then they would be heretics, or at least be in the grips of a pernicious error and sin gravely,

who obstinately assert something against the definition of the Pontiff. But this is false, because Cyprian obstinately resisted Pope Stephen who defined that heretics are not to be re-baptized, which is clear from the letter of the same Cyprian to Pompeius, and still not only was he not a heretic, but he also did not sin mortally. For, mortal sins are not removed except by repentance, even if someone should die for the faith; and still the Church reveres Cyprian as a saint, and he does not seem ever to have changed his mind about his error. And this is confirmed by Augustine, who in book 1, chapter 18 and elsewhere on baptism says that the Churches were uncertain about that question, and that Cyprian and others, preserving charity, could have disagreed among themselves, as long as there was not a decision of a general council; therefore, Augustine thought that the judgment of the Roman Pontiff was not indubitable.

I respond to the example of Cyprian: Surely Cyprian was not a heretic, both because they are not thought to be manifestly heretics who say that the Pontiff can err, and also because without doubt Pope Stephen did not define as an article of faith that heretics are not to be re-baptized, although he did order them not to be re-baptized, as is clear from the fact that he did not excommunicate Cyprian and others who disagreed with him. As also on the contrary, Cyprian in a council of 80 bishops defined that heretics are to be re-baptized, and still he did not want this to be a matter of faith, while clearly protesting that because of this he did not want to separate himself from those who held the contrary view.

There is nothing opposed to this in the fact that, as Eusebius writes in book 7, chapter 4 of his History and Augustine in chapter 14 of his book on baptism, Pope Stephen not only commanded that those baptized by heretics should not be re-baptized, but he also thought that those who disobeyed should be excommunicated. For, although he thought that those who disobeyed should be excommunicated, still that was nothing other than a threat; for it is certain from Vincent Lérins in his book on profanation and from Augustine in the place cited that Stephen and Cyprian were always joined together in unity.

And in this way our response is given to the confirmation. For, after the definition of the Pontiff, he was still free to think differently, as Augustine says, because the Pontiff did not want to make this matter itself an article of faith without a general council, but he wanted in the interim only to preserve the ancient custom. But whether Cyprian sinned mortally by disobeying the Pontiff is not absolutely certain. For, on the one hand, he does not seem to have sinned mortally, because he did not sin except out of ignorance; for he thought that the Pontiff erred calamitously, and given that opinion, he was bound not to obey him, because he could not act against his conscience. And the ignorance of Cyprian does not seem to have been crass, or affected, but probable, and therefore excusing him from mortal sin; for he knew that the Pontiff had not defined it as a matter of faith, and at the same time he saw that the council of 80 bishops agreed with him. Therefore, St. Augustine in book 1 chapter 18 against the Donatists clearly teaches that Cyprian sinned only venially and preserved charity; and so by the suffering of martyrdom it was easily taken away; and in chapter 19 he says that this sin was like a spot on the brilliance of a holy soul which the abundance of charity covered over.

On the other hand it seems that he sinned mortally because he did not obey an express apostolic precept, and gravely annoyed the Pontiff who was thinking correctly. For

although Stephen did not define the matter as being of faith, still he seriously commanded that heretics should not be re-baptized, as Cyprian himself admits in his letter to Pompeius; Cyprian should have obeyed this command and subjected his judgment to the judgment of his superior, and at least he should not have uttered harsh words, such as he said against Pope Stephen in his letter to Pompeius, where he calls him proud, ignorant, and burdened with a blind and wrong mentality, etc. Therefore St. Augustine in letter 48 to Vincent tries to defend Cyprian in another way, by saying that, either he did not write the things found there, or that afterwards he repented of his error and changed his mind before his death, although such a retraction has not been found.

The fourth reason: The African Council in the letter to Pope Celestine said that the provincial council was less capable of erring than the Roman Pontiff: *Unless perhaps,* it said, *there is someone who believes that our God can communicate the Justice of judging to anyone he pleases, and deny it to innumerable priests gathered together in a council.* But it is certain that provincial councils can err; therefore much more can a Pope err.

I respond that a council speaks, not about a judgment of faith, but about the judgment of a ήηοζ that is, about the cases of bishops and priests, who are accused of some crime. But in these cases we confess that the Pontiff does not have the assistance of the Holy Spirit by which he cannot err. You can add to this that we are not necessarily held to believe whatever those bishops say in that letter, especially since is it quite apparent that they were upset by the crimes of Apiarius, who had fled to the Roman Pontiff, and they are somewhat excessive in their language. This is so notwithstanding the fact that the African council was confirmed by Leo IV dist. 20; for, the decrees of the council were confirmed, not the letters.

The final reason is that of Nilus in his book on the primacy and he aigues like this: The Roman Pontiff can fall into other vices, like avarice, pride, etc., therefore also into the vice of heresy. For, in 1 Tim. 1:19 Paul says that some have made shipwreck of their faith, because previously they had lost their good conscience. Likewise the Pope, by living a bad life, can deny God by his deeds, according to the saying in Tit. 1:16: *They profess to know God, but they deny him by their deeds,* Therefore he can also deny the faith by word, for it seems that it is easier to deny by words than by deeds.

I respond to the first argument: hence it can rightly be concluded that the Pope from his nature can fall into heresy, but he cannot fall given the singular assistance of God, which Christ obtained for him by his prayer: Christ prayed that his faith would not fail, but not that he may not fall into some other vice.

To the second argument I say that the Apostle in that place does not understand just any bad deeds, but deeds which proceed from a faithless heart; for he is speaking about the Jews who were not sincerely converted to the faith, and who, although they professed that they knew God, still by their deeds denied it, because by forbidding certain foods, as by their nature unclean, they testified that they did not truly know the Creator of all things; in addition, the Pope neither does such things nor can do them. But if by the deeds any kind of sins are understood, it is false that it is easier to deny God by word than by deed; for, he who denies by word, denies simply and expressly; he who denies by deed, denies implicitly and in a certain way, but not simply.

CHAPTER VIII

ON THE ERRORS THAT ARE FALSELY ATTRIBUTED TO THE ROMAN PONTIFFS, PETER, LINUS, CLETUS, TELESPHORUS, VICTOR, ZEPHYRINUS, URBAN, PONTIAN, CORNELIUS AND MARCELLINUS, WHO WERE NOT ONLY PONTIFFS, BUT ALSO MARTYRS.

Let us come now to the individual Pontiffs whom the adversaries claim were in error. Peter is the first of the Roman Pontiffs, whom Nilus says in his book on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff erred in faith not once, but twice. Especially by this argument he thinks he has demonstrated that the Roman Pontiffs can err in faith. For none of the Roman Pontiffs received more privileges from God than Peter; also, it is evident from the divine writings that Peter erred twice. For, he both denied Christ in Matt. 26 and he forced the Gentiles to act like Jews in Gal. 2. The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 2, book 2, chapter 10, columns 58-60, besides these two errors add also another thirteen lapses of St. Peter, concerning which we wrote above in book 1, chapter 3.

We respond that St. Peter, when he denied Christ, had not yet begun to be the Sovereign Pontiff. For it is certain that leadership of the Church was given to him by Christ in John 21, when the Lord after his resurrection said to him: *Simon, son of John, feed my sheep.* Therefore that denial of Peter should not be listed among the errors of the Roman Pontiffs. Moreover, I add that Christ was denied by Peter in word, not in his heart; therefore Peter lost the confession of faith, not faith itself, as we showed above in chapter 3.

But that at times St. Peter forced Gentiles to act like Jews was not an error of preaching, but of social intercourse, as Tertullian says in his book on prescription against heretics. For St. Peter did not sanction by a decree that they should be Judaized, but rather he taught the contrary in Acts 15, because for a time in Antioch, lest he offend the recently converted Jews, he separated himself from the banquets of Gentiles; by his example in a certain sense he also forced Barnabas to Judaize. But we do not deny that the Pontiffs by their example can give an occasion of erring, but we do deny that they can prescribe *ex cathedra* an error that is to be followed by the whole Church. But the examples of the Pontiffs are not as dangerous for the Church as doctrine is; since the Lord instructed us, saying: *Observe whatever they tell you, but not what they do* (Matt. 23:3). See what we said above in book 1, chapter 28.

The second Pontiff Linus, who immediately followed St. Peter in the apostolic See, is ridiculed by the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 10, col. 627; he ordered that women should not enter the Church without having their heads covered; for this is what they say: *He instituted that no woman (surely worthy of episcopal concern) is to enter the temple unless her head is covered.* But what if Linus added that it should be done because of the angels? Doubtless they would call in a superstition. But the Centuriatorians do not remember, I believe, that the Apostle Paul did not consider it unworthy of his care to prescribe in 1 Cor. 11:10 that women should cover their heads because of the angels. Ambrose explains this in the sense that in the Church this should be observed out of reverence for the priests, who in the Scriptures are called angels.

Thirdly, the Magdeburgenses reprimand Cletus in the same Centuries in book 2, chapter 20, col. 628 because he built a memorial to St. Peter and adorned it, that is, St. Peter acted so badly in the Church that he merited to be forgotten completely. But if St. Cletus is to be reprimanded because he constructed some kind of monument for the bones of St. Peter, then how great a sin was it, I ask, of Constantine, who adorned the memoiy of St. Peter with such a magnificent basilica and with so many gold and silver gifts? But all pious men have always judged differently about these matters than our adversaries now judge them. Certainly Caius, an excellent author and one who lived around the time of the apostles, as Eusebius recounts in book 2, chapter 25 of his History in the version of Ruffinus, calls the tombs of Peter and Paul trophies, on which the Roman Church is established as on very solid columns.

John Chiysostom in his last homily on the letter to the Romans says that he was seized by a great desire to go to Rome in order to prostrate himself before the tombs of Peter and Paul. And hear this, I beseech you, with how much honor he speaks about the city of Rome, and the bodies of the apostles and their tombs: *Like a large and strong body,* he said, *it* (Rome) *has two bright eyes, that is, the bodies of those saints. Heaven itself does not shine so brightly, when the sun sends out her rays from herself, as the city of the Romans does when it pours forth those two lights everywhere on earth.* And after that: *With what kind of two crowns is that city crowned with? With what kind of golden chains is she surrounded? What kind of fountains does she have? Therefore I celebrate this city, not because of its abundance of gold, not because of its columns, not because of some other fancy, but because of those pillars of the Church. Who now will give me the opportunity to be near the body of Paul? To embrace his tomb? To see the dust of his body?* And after that again: *This body fortifies this city, which is safer than any tower, than many walls and fortifications, and with it also the body of Peter. For he honored him when he was living: I went up, he said, to see Peter.* Theodoretus also in a letter to Leo, when he praises Rome for many other things, then especially he does so because of the tombs of the apostles, which (as he himself says) illumine the souls of the faithful. I am omitting many testimonies that could be added here, because the proper argument about the relics of the saints will be handled in its own place.

The fourth Pontiff Telesphorus, who was the ninth after Peter and was consumed by a glorious martyrdom according to Irenaeus in book 3, chapter 3, was accused by the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 2, chapter 10, col. 212 with these words: *First of all he commanded clerics to fast from meat for seven weeks before Easter, but the contrary is written: Let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink. Then he multiplies masses, and increases their rites, and he determines the times when the Lord's Supper can be celebrated and when it cannot. Likewise, he exalts the dignity and holiness of the clergy too much above the people, as if it were not written: You are all one in Christ Jesus. And so he does not want priests to be charged or accused by the people; and he calls this law the solid wall of his order, constituted by himself and the Fathers against persecutors.*

These are the errors of Telesphorus; these things indeed are judged to be errors by the Centuriatorians, because they disagree with the rule of Luther; but if we judge fairly,

should it not rather be said that the dogmas of Luther, who does not allow the choice of foods, nor Masses, or the order of priests over the people, are erroneous and false because they disagree with the rule of Telesphorus? For, since Telesphorus was a holy martyr, and so near to the time of the apostles that he could have spoken with Peter and Paul and John, is it not more credible and better to be able to know from him the teaching of Christ, than it is from Luther, who was not a martyr and who lived more than 1400 years after the time of the apostles? This is especially so because the reasons given by the Magdeburgenses are childish and have been refuted thousands of times.

For what they cite from Paul: *Let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink,* does not conflict with abstinence from meat which is taken, or not taken for a time to tame the petulance of the body; but this is contrary to the Jewish abstinence, which never allows certain foods because according to the old law they are unclean. For thus in the same place Paul says to the Colossians: *Let no one pass judgment on you in questions of food and drink or with regard to a festival or new moon or Sabbath. These are only a shadow of what is to come* (2:16-17).

What they add, that the Supper of the Lord was not instituted because of numbers, or rites, or times, we do not deny. But what is to be drawn from that? Did Telesphorus err for this reason, that for the birth of the Lord he wanted three Masses to be celebrated, and added some rites, and established the times when the Masses should be celebrated? For although the Supper of the Lord was not instituted because of numbers, rites and times, nevertheless in order for the Lord's Supper to be celebrated properly, the number, rites and times should be determined, lest perhaps such a great sacrament should be treated with confusion rather than order.

Finally, what they cite from the Apostle: *You are all one in Christ Jesus* (Gal. 3:28), proves nothing less than that priests are not more worthy than lay persons; for, Paul explains how we are all one in Christ in Rom. 12:4 and 1 Cor. 12:12ff., where he says, we are one body where there are different members—eyes, hands, feet, some more noble and worthy than others.

The fifth Pontiff is Victor, the 15th Pope after Peter; his good name was sullied long ago by some heretics by claiming that he taught that Christ was less than a man, as Eusebius reports in book 5, chapter 28 of his History. But in the same place Eusebius demonstrates that that was false and a calumny, because it is certain that the author of that heresy was a man by the name of Theodotus who was excommunicated by Victor.

The sixth Pontiff Zephyrinus, successor of Victor, seems to have approved the heresy of Montanus. For, Tertullian writes in his book against Praxeas that the Roman Pontiff acknowledged the prophecies of Montanus, and by that acknowledgement bringing peace to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia, was persuaded by Praxeas to revoke the letter of peace, which he had already sent. But it is certain from the histories that Zephyrinus at that time was the Pontiff of Rome. Therefore Rhénan in his Annotations to Tertullian writes in this place in the margin, "the Roman bishop Montanizes." And it cannot be said that at the time the heresy of Montanus had not yet been condemned by the Church. For, as Tertullian says in the same place, Praxeas persuaded the Pontiff to revoke the letter of peace, especially for the reason that his predecessors had previously condemned that heresy.

I respond: Tertullian is not to be trusted completely in this matter, since he was a Montanist. For, just as shortly before Artemon falsely boasted that the Roman Pontiff Victor agreed with him, as we know from Eusebius, so now Tertullian the Montanist attempts to describe the Roman Pontiff as approving the thinking of Montanus. Otherwise, why did not Eusebius, or any other author, mention this error in the Roman Pontiff?

But because lies often are wont to be based on something true, it is credible that the Pontiff Zephyrinus was persuaded by the Montanists that the doctrine of Montanus was not different from the doctrine of the Roman Church; and therefore that the same Pontiff wanted to make peace with them, which his predecessors had taken away. This was not in the sense that he would approve the error which his elders had rejected, but because he thought the Montanists had been falsely accused of those errors. But this is not to err regarding the faith, nor to Montanize, as Rhénan lies, but to err concerning the person, which is something that has happened to many other holy men. For Ruffinus writes in book 10, chapter 11 in his History that Arius, in order to persuade the Emperor Constantine that he was Catholic, wrote down his faith with such artistry that he was thought by Catholics to be a Catholic, but by his own he was acknowledged to be what he really was. And Leo in letter 86 to Nicetas of Aquileia warns the bishop that he demand that Pelagians returning to the Church abjure their heresy in very clear words, because they are often wont to deceive the Church with such a clever confession of their faith thaï they seem to be Catholic when they really are not. Such a thing seems to have happened also to the Pontiff Zephyrinus.

The seventh Pontiff Urban, the 18th after Peter, was reprimanded by the Cenuriatorians with these words: *He instituted Confirmation after Baptism; and he says blasphemously that the Holy Spirit is received by the imposition of the hands of bishops and that they become fully Christians* (in Centuries 3, chapter 10, col. 277), and in col. 282 they accuse Cornelius of the same error.

First of all, they lie that Confirmation was instituted by Urban. For, its use is mentioned in Acts 8 and 10, where the apostles impose hands on the baptized and they receive the Holy Spirit. And furthermore Tertullian, who preceded Urban and Cornelius, mentions Confirmation in several places; in the book on the resurrection of the dead he said: *The body is washed and the soul is purified; the body is anointed and the soul is consecrated.* And in his book on prescription, while speaking about the devil, who imitates our Baptism and Confirmation, he said: *He washes some of his believers and followers, and he marks his soldiers on the forehead.* And in his book on Baptism he said: *Then the hand is imposed in order to bless by calling down and inviting the Holy Spirit.* Do you see in Tertullian anointing, signing on the forehead, the imposition of the hand, the coming of the Holy Spirit? Therefore what could Urban institute? But it is certain that Tertullian lived before Urban, for Tertullian lived during the time of Severus, and of his son Antoninus, as the Magdeurgenses teach, based on Jerome, in the same Centuries 3, chapter 10, col. 277. Why do the same Centuriatorians in the same place number among the faults of Tertullian that he acknowledged after Baptism the necessity of anointing and the sign of the cross? Therefore, how do those things fit together, namely, that they say something was instituted by Urban, which they themselves previously had placed among

the faults of Tertullian who lived before Urban?

Then the Centuriatorians add that what Urban says is blasphemy, namely, that the Holy Spirit is received and men become fully Christian through the imposition of the hand of bishops. This does not require a refutation, since they adduce no proof for it, especially since Cornelius says the same thing, as they themselves admit, and also Cyprian in book 1, letter 12, Cyril in catechism 3 on mystagogy, Augustine in tractate 6 on the letters of John, and other Fathers not rarely.

The eighth Pontiff is Pontianus, Urban's successor, whom the Magdeburgenses blame in Centuries 3, chapter 10, col. 278 because he wrote that priests by their own mouth confect the body of Christ, and give him to the people, and that through priests God accepts the offerings of others, and forgives their sins, and reconciles them to himself. The Centuriatorians call this thinking a blasphemy, but they offer no evidence that it is blasphemy. Therefore they should not take it ill, if we put more credence in the holy institution of a martyr and successor of the apostles than we do in Luther, especially since we read the same thing passim in the writings of all the old Fathers.

Now listen to Jerome in his letter to Heliodorus: *May it not happen,* he said, *that I say anything bad about those who, succeeding in the apostolic grade, confect the body of Christ with holy words, and through whom we also are Christians; they have the keys of the kingdom of heaven and in a certain way pass judgment before the day of judgment.*

Listen to Augustine in letter 122 Victorinus, where he said about the women captives among the barbarians: *Pray to God for them, and ask that he may also teach them to say such things as St. Azaria poured forth before others in her prayer and confession. For thus they are in the land of their captivity, as they were in that land where they were not able to sacrifice to the Lord in the accustomed way. So now they cannot either bring an oblation to the altar of God, or find there a priest through whom they can make an offering to God.*

Listen to Chrysostom in book 3 on the priesthood: *It was permitted to the priests alone of the Jews,* he said, *to cleanse the leprosy of the body, or to put it more correctly, not to cleanse but to show one already cleansed. But it has been granted to our priests not just to show that the stains on the soul have been cleansed, but actually to cleanse souls.* These are his words. Therefore, what Pontianus says—that through priests the body of the Lord is confected, the sin-offerings of others are accepted by God, the sins of men are forgiven, was said also by approved authors like Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, and also by many others whom I have on purpose omitted.

The ninth Pontiff is Cornelius, whom the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 3, chapter 6, col. 145 and in chapter 7, col. 165 say taught that in the chalice of the Lord only water should be offered; this is a clear error against the gospel. But this is a shameless calumny; for, they prove this only because Cyprian in book 2, letter 3 to Cornelius argues strongly against this error. Cyprian does not say that this error was made by the one to whom he is writing, but by some other persons. Then, that letter is not written to Cornelius, but to a certain Caecelius, an African bishop, and all the extant copies bear witness to this. But the Mageburgenses then perhaps had drunk abundantly, and with sparkling and trembling eyes read one name for the other. You can add to this that Pope Alexander, a predecessor

of Cornelius, had already published a decree that there shou Id be nothing else in the chalice but wine mixed with water.

Finally, if because of this letter they reprimand others, why do the Centuriatorians not also reprimand themselves? Indeed Cyprian in this letter often calls the Eucharist a sacrifice, and teaches that not only water, not only wine, but wine mixed with water is to be offered, but Lutherans both obstinately deny that the Eucharist is a sacrifice, and they think that in the chalice only wine without water is to be consecrated.

The tenth Pontiff is Marcellinus, who sacrificed to idols, as is certain from the Pontiff Damasus from the council of Sinuessa and from the letter of Nicholas I to Michael. But Marcellinus neither taught something against the faith, nor was a heretic, or infidel, except by an external act because of his fear of death. But whether because of that external act he lost the pontificate, or not, makes little difference; since he immediately abdicated from the pontificate, and shortly thereafter he was crowned with martyrdom. I believe, however, that he did not *ipso facto* lose the pontificate, because it is sufficiently certain to all that he sacrificed to idols only out of fear. You can add to this what St. Augustine in his book on baptism in chapter 16 against Petilian says, namely, that Marcellinus was innocent, and none of the ancient historians mention this moral fault.

CHAPTER IX

ON THE OBJECTIONS MADE TO LIBERIUS AND FELIX II

The eleventh Pontiff accused of error is Liberius; for although the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 4, chapter 10, col. 1284 do not attempt to define anything concerning Liberius, nevertheless Tilmann Heshusius in book 1, chapter 9 on the Church brazenly affirms that he was infected with the Arian heresy. And surely he has some serious authors as witnesses of his opinion: Athanasius in his letter on leading a solitary life, Jerome in the Chronicle and in the Catalogue of authors in Fortunatian, and Damasus in his life of Liberius.

I respond: Concerning Liberius two things are certain, and there is one thing doubtful. First, it is certain that from the beginning of his pontificate until his exile, he was a strong defender of the Catholic religion. All authors who speak about that time testify to the truth of that statement, like Ammianus Marcellinus in book 15 of his history, Athanasius in both Apologies, Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 22 of his History, Sulpitius in book 2 of his sacred history, Socrates in book 2, chapter 29 of his ecclesiastical history, Sozomenus in book 4, chapter 10, Theodoretus in book 2, chapters 16 and 17, Nicephorus in book 9, chapters 35-37.

Secondly, it is certain that Liberius after his return from exile was also truly orthodox and pious. For, as Socrates writes in book 4, chapter 11, after he returned from exile Liberius did not want to receive into the Church the Macedonians, unless they openly abominated the heresy. Moreover, also after his death he was always regarded as a saint, as is clear from the words of Ambrose in book 3 on virginity, where he says at the beginning: *It is time, sister, to observe the holy precepts of Liberius, of happy memory, since the more holy a man is, so are his words more pleasing.* Likewise from the words of Epiphanius in heresies 75: *Eustatius,* he said, *together with many bishops led a legation to blessed Liberius, the bishop of Rome.* Basil also in a letter 74 to the western bishops said: *Certain things were proposed to him by blessed Liberius.*

Finally, Siricius, the second Pontiff after Liberius, in a letter to Ilymeric calls Liberius, his predecessor of venerable memory. How, I ask, can those Fathers call the dead Liberius blessed, if he died in heresy? Therefore, one doubt does remain, namely, whether in the middle time, that is, in his return from exile he did something against the faith. Indeed Sulpitius, Socrates, Sozomenus and Nicephorus indicate in the places cited that Liberius always was the same, and never failed in anything concerning the constancy of the faith. But Athanasius and Jerome in the places cited openly say that he, having grown tired of exile, finally was moved to endorse a heresy. Hilary can be added to them, since in his book against Constantius he says this: *Then you directed your war against Rome; you took from there the bishop, and O you miserable man, I know not whether you left with more impiety than you had on your return.* But Ruffinus in book 10, chapter 27 of his Histoiy says that he could not know for certain whether Liberius had signed the heresy.

Of these opinions the second one seem to us to be more reliable. For, Athanasius,

Hilary and Jerome are authors who are both more ancient and more serious than the others, and they narrate the matter not as doubtful, but as certain and established. Furthermore, I myself read the hand-written letters of Liberius in the Vatican library; some were written to the emperor and some to the eastern bishops; in them he says quite clearly that he wanted finally to acquiesce to the will of the emperor. In this matter, unless we are mistaken, Liberius for some time failed in his constancy of defending the faith. We are forced to exclude Felix II, who acted as Pontiff while Liberius was still living, from the number of the Pontiffs. However, the Catholic Church venerates this same Felix as pope and martyr. Finally, Sozomenus in book 4, chapter 14 of his History, and Nicephorus in book 9, chapter 37 in a rather obscure manner, indicate that Liberius at the council of Sirmio agreed with the Arians Valente and Ursacius, and when peace was made, he received back his See, helped also by the documents of the same council. But even though these things may be true, still Liberius did not teach heresy and he was not a heretic, but he sinned only by an external act, like St. Marcellinus and, unless I am mistaken, he committed a lesser sin than Marcellinus.

St. Athanasius teaches that he truly was not a heretic, where he says that Liberius unwillingly and being coerced by the force of torments did what he did, and it should not be thought that it was his opinion, which threats and terrors extorted, but rather the opinion he expressed when he was free; and it can easily be proved that he did not teach heresy. For, as is gathered from the words of Athanasius, and from the letters ol Liberius himself, Liberius committed two evils: one, that he signed the condemnation of Athanasius; the second, that he associated with heretics; but in neither case did he expressly violate the faith. For, although heretics persecuted Athanasius because of his faith, they alleged as an excuse not the reason of his faith, but crimes of a moral nature, and Liberius agreed with the condemnation of Athanasius because of those alleged crimes, not because of his faith. Similarly, when he associated with heretics, because they pretended to be Catholics; for in his letters Liberius says that he communicated with the eastern bishops, because he found that their faith agreed with the Catholic faith, and was far removed from the Arian perfidy.

Moreover, Sozomenus in book 4, chapter 11 and Nicephorus in book 9, chapter 27 say that in the peace, which Liberius made with the Arian bishops, nothing else was required of Liberius but that he subscribe the Sirmion confession published against Photinus and the Antiochene confession published against the Encennians; although these confessions do not have the word ὁμούσιος, nevertheless they are Catholic, and Hilary explains them in his book on the councils as Catholic.

There is also the fact, as Sozomenus and Nicephorus report in the cited places, that Liberius not only did not sign the Arian confession, but he also published a confession, before he left Sirmio, in which he openly excommunicated those who denied that the Son is similar to the Father in substance and in all other things. He did that because the Arians spread a false rumor that Liberius had begun to teach that the Son is not consubstantial with the Father.

Someone will say: If that is so, then why did Jerome in the Chronicle and in the Catalogue of writings in Fortunatian say that Liberius was forced to sign the heresy? I

respond that Liberius, although not expressly, but still implicitly agreed with the heresy; for, he permitted Athanasius to be condemned, whom he knew suffered persecution by reason of the faith, and he associated with Valente and Ursacius, whom he knew were heretics, although they pretended for his sake to be something else. Therefore this is what Jerome wanted to signify.

The twelfth Pontiff, who is accused by heretics of error in the faith, is Felix II, whom Tilmann Heshusius in book 1, chapter 9 on the Church contends was an Arian, and he proves it from the testimony of St. Jerome, who in his Catalogue of writings says this about Aeacius: *Acacius, whom because he had one eye they called* μονόφθαλον, was bishop of the Church in Caesarea. And after that: *Under the Emperor Constantius he was so renowned that he constituted the Arian bishop Felix in Rome in place of Liberius.* But we respond that Felix never was an Arian, although at times he associated with Arians, namely during the time in which he was not the Pope; but after he began to be the true Pope, not only was he not an Arian, but he also publicly condemned the Arians, and because of the persecution of the Arians he merited from the Lord the crown of martyrdom.

Therefore the pontificate of Liberius and Felix must be explained, as briefly as possible, and from this explanation the marvelous providence of God in preserving the apostolic see will be apparent. When Liberius was exiled because of his Catholic faith, the Roman clergy swore that they would not acknowledge any other Pontiff as long as Liberius was alive. Jerome bears witness to this in the Chronicle, although the words have been transposed. For those words, *when he was exiled, all the clergy swore, etc.,* which are placed in the year 351, should be placed after the words. *Liberius, bishop of the Romans, is sent into exile,* which are placed in the year 361.

Then by the activiety of the Arians, and especially of Acacius, bishop of Caesarea, the deacon Felix is created the Roman bishop in place of Liberius; because of this benefice he freely associated with them, although he himself was not an Arian. For, Ruffinus writes the following in book 10, chapter 22 of his History: *In his* (Liberius's) *place the deacon Felix was substituted, and he was stained not so much by a diversity of sect, as by the agreement of association and arrangement.* And Theodoretus in book 2, chapter 17 of his History said: *Liberius was succeeded by one of his faithful deacons, whose name was Felix; although he preserved the whole faith proclaimed by the Council of Nicaea, nevertheless he freely associated with those who were eager to weaken that same faith. And because of this none of the inhabitants of Rome wanted to enter into the Church, as long as he was there.*

Sozomenus also writes the same thing in book 4, chapter 10 of his History, and Jerome did not disagree with this in the Catalogue of writers concerning Acacius. For that word "Arian" added to the name of Felix seems to have crept in form somewhere else. For, the ancient manuscripts do not have that word, as Marianus Victorius noted in his comments on this place; and the translation of Sophronius into Greek does not have it. And, I consider this to be very important, Freculphus in book 4, chapter 8 and Ado of Vienne in the Chronicle, quoting word for word this whole passage from Jerome, do not have the word "Arian."

Finally, it is not in any way credible that Jerome and Ruffinus, in a history known very well to both of them, could disagree to such an extent that one denies what the other affirms. But even if Felix was an Arian (but which until now has not been proven) that would not do any harm to the apostolic See. For, it is certain that at that time Felix was a schismatic Pope, not the true and legitimate Pontiff, since there cannot be at the same time two Pontiffs; for, at that time Liberius, the true Pope, was still living. Therefore (as we pointed out above from Theodoretus) none of the Catholics in Rome at that time wanted to associate with Felix.

Then after two years the fall of Liberius took place, which we mentioned above; but then the Roman clergy, when Liberius had been deprived of the apostolic dignity, turned to Felix, whom they knew was Catholic, and from that time Felix began to be the true Pontiff. For although Liberius was not a heretic, still he was considered to be a heretic, because of the peace he made with the Arians; and because of that presumption the pontificate could rightly be taken from him. For men are not bound to, or cannot scrutinize hearts; but when they see someone acting in a heretical way, they simply judge that he is a heretic, and they condemn him as a heretic. Jerome indicates this in the Chronicle when he says that many of the Roman clergy committed perjury, and submitted themselves to Felix. They are said to have committed perjury, because they did not keep the oath which they had taken not to accept another Pontiff.

In addition, Felix now being the true Pope, aware of the danger to the Church and the faith, doubtless at the inspiration of God who never abandons his Church, not only ceased all communication with the Arians, but also, having called a council, declared the Emperor Constantius and the bishops Ursacius and Valente, with whom Liberius had made peace, to be truly heretics. And because of that, when Liberius returned to Rome, Felix with his followers was expelled by the Arians, and not long afterwards died, either by beheading or worn out by hard labor; for there is no certainty about how he died.

But that these things happened in this way, that is, that Felix after the fall of Liberius became the true Pontiff, and died for the faith, is proved by these arguments. First, it is clearly attested to by Damasus, or by whoever is the pontifical author of the life of Felix. St. Jerome seems to signify the same thing in the Chronicle, when he says about the Roman clergy: *After a year they were expelled with Felix, because Liberius overcome by the weariness of exile, and endorsing the heretical perversity, entered Rome like a conqueror.* For, these words signify the persecution instigated against Felix, and instigated by those who favored the Arians. From this it follows that Felix himself suffered persecution for the Catholic faith.

Secondly, all the ancient martryologies, both those composed by Bede, Adonis and Usuardus, and the manuscripts for August 4 commemorate St. Felix II, Pope and martyr, who declared Constantius to be a heretic. In addition, St. Gregory I both in the Antiphonarium and in the sacramentary placed a complete ecclesiastical office to be read at Mass on August 4 in memory of St. Felix, Pope and martyr. Micrologus in the book on Ecclesiastical Observances, chapter 43, testifies that he is the Roman Pontiff Felix and therefore the one about whom we are speaking; therefore, since the Catholic Church already for a thousand years has honored this Felix as Pope and martyr, he should not be

excluded from the number of Pontiffs, even if we can offer no other reason.

Thirdly, Pope Felix, the great-great-grandfather of St. Gregory, by the very ancient authors is called Pope Felix IV, for example, by Deacon John in book 1, chapter 1 of his life of St. Gregory, and by Leo Hostiensis in book 1, chapter 1 of his Chronicle. But he could not be that "IV," unless he was our "II," because there are only two Felixes, besides this one, before Felix IV; therefore, over a thousand years ago this Felix was included in the number of the Pontiffs; for they do not count the schismatics.

Fourthly, since in Rome in the year 1582 there was a doubt whether or not this St. Felix should be included in the new martyrology, by chance a marble coffin was found in the Basilica of Saints Cosmas and Damian, with this inscription cut into the marble in ancient lettering: HERE LIES THE BODY OF SAINT FELIX POPE and MARTYR, WHO CONDEMNED CONSTANTIUS AS A HERETIC. And this discovery occurred on July 28, that is, the day before the memory of this Felix was wont to be celebrated. This not undeservedly was believed to be the work of divine providence.

Now after the death of St. Felix, Liberius again reconciled himself with the Roman clergy, and presented himself as the Catholic leader, as we showed above from Socrates in the case of the Macedonians. Therefore, with the agreement of all he began again to preside legitimately, and he continued as such until his death. So this is the reason why in the catalogue of the Pontiffs some of the ancients did not place Felix, as Augustine in letter 165 and Optatus in book 2 say, because the whole time of Felix was included in the pontificate of Liberius.

The thirteenth Pontiff is a certain Pope Leo, whom some say succeeded this Felix II and was plainly an Arian, and that he died the same way Arius perished, that is, by the eruption of all his intestines, while he was trying to cleanse his stomach. Vincent reports this in book 14, chapter 23 of his special history, and also Conrad Halberstat in his Chronicle. The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 4, chapter 10 on the life of Felix II think that this is not improbable.

But without doubt this Leo was a fictional Pontiff. For it is certain that Leo I is the one who reigned at the time of the Council of Chalcedon, that is, about a hundred years after the time of Felix II; then all the authors, like Augustine, Optatus, Theodoretus, Ruffinus, and also more recent writers, like Sigebert, Martinus Polonus, Platina, and many other serious authors, say that after the death of Liberius and Felix Damasus was the next Pontiff.

Perhaps this fable took its origin from the opinion held about the heresy of Liberius, and from the persecution of Catholics, after Felix II had been expelled, because Liberius, after the expulsion of Felix, like a lion began to rage against Catholics, as they falsely think; idle men imagined that a certain Arian Pope Leo presided over the Church after Felix II. But these things are to be ranked among fables.

CHAPTER X

ON SIRICIUS, INNOCENT, AND ANOTHER SEVEN PONTIFFS

The fourteenth is Siricius, whom John Calvin accuses in book 4, chapter 12 § 24 of his Institutes, saying that when he wrote to the Spaniards, he called marriage a pollution. But Calvin in his usual manner lies shamelessly. For, Siricius does not call a true and legitimate marriage a pollution, but the illicit union of those who, after having performed their public penance, return again to the same union, because of which they performed their penance, rather than to enter into a legitimate marriage.

The fifteenth is Innocent I, whom the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 5, chapter 10 on the life of Innocent say gravely erred, because in letter 2, chapter 12 he ordered that a holy virgin with vows, who married or committed fornication, could not be accepted for penance, as long as the man lived with whom she sinned. For it seems to be unjust that a penitent woman is not to be absolved, unless the man who seduced her has already died. Likewise, because in letter 18 to Alexander of Antioch he wrote that the baptism of Arians is valid, but that the Holy Spirit is not conferred by it, because they have separated themselves from the Church. There he seems to want to say that the efficacy of holy baptism depends on the goodness of the minister; but this is contrary to the common doctrine of the Church. Likewise, because in letter 22, chapter 1 he taught that a man who has married a widow cannot be a priest, since Moses in Leviticus prescribed that a priest may have a virgin as his wife, as if Christians are still bound by the judicial laws of the Old Testament.

I respond to the first objection that Innocent wants to say that those virgins should not be accepted for penance, who do not want to be separated from their adultery, unless it takes place after the man's death. And this is very just, for those must not be absolved by the Church who want to persist in their sin.

To the second objection I say that Innocent is speaking in that place about those who are baptized or ordained by heretics, since they also are polluted by the same heresy. For, those individuals truly receive the sacrament of baptism or ordination, but they do not receive the grace of the Holy Spirit, which cannot be in heretics. And in ordination the ordained not only do not receive grace from the heretics, but they also do not receive the right to exercise those orders; for, the ordainer has lost that right because of his heresy; for he could not give what he himself did not have. On this see Gloss 1, q. 1 canon on the Arians.

To the third objection I say that Innocent does not want to say that we are bound by the Jewish laws, but he wants to argue from a similitude, or from the major in this way: the priests in the Old Testament were bound by a divine precept not to many a widow; therefore it is much more fitting that in priests of the new law the Church requires that they not be husbands of widows, because of the excellence of the Christian priesthood.

The sixteenth is Celestine, whom Laurence Valla says was infected with the heresy of Nestorius in his declamation on the false donation of Constantine. But Laurence clearly is lying, because Celestine not only never was accused of embracing this heresy,

but it was he who especially condemned this heresy, as is clear from Prosper in the Chronicle for the year 43 land from the whole Council of Ephesus. Valla was deceived by the equivocation of a name. For, there was a Pelagian heretic names Celestine, who had some things in common with the Nestorians.

The seventeenth is Leo I, who in letter 79 to Nicetus says that those women who, thinking their husbands were dead or would never return from captivity, married again, did not sin; however, if their husbands returned, they were bound to abide by the first marriage; but if they did not want to do that, they were not bound. Here there seem to be two errors: one, that the woman did not sin, if she married another man, when she knows the first husband is still living, but would never return; the second, that the woman could remain with the second husband, if the first one did not want her. The Magdeburgenses point out this error in Centuries 5, chapter 10 in the life of Leo I.

I respond that Leo erred in neither case. For, when he says that the woman did not sin who marries again, while the first husband is still living, is speaking only about that woman who got married because she thought that the first husband was dead, as he clearly explains in the same place. But concerning the woman who marries again, because she thinks her first husband will never return, he does not say that she sins or does not sin, because he thought this matter was per se known, namely, that she sinned. Consequently he wants it to be understood that the man should return to his wife, if she wants him, even if otherwise he does not want her. For the man and the woman are equal in this matter. Therefore, if one of the spouses wants to return to the marriage, the other is held necessarily to agree; but if neither wants to return, they can remain separated regarding the use of marriage. And Leo permits only this. From this it does not follow that the woman can remain with her second husband; for, Leo in the same place says clearly that the first marriage is indissoluble and is necessarily renewed, while the second one is dissolved, because it cannot be a true marriage.

The eighteenth is Gelasius, whose two erroneous opinions concerning Catholics are noted by the Centuriatorians in Centuries 5, chapter 4 on the Lord's Supper, and chapter 10 on the life of Gelasius. One is in the book against Eutyches—that in the sacrament true bread remains with the body of Christ; the other is in Gratian on the consecration in d. 2 of the canon *"Comperimus":* namely, that one cannot, without a grave sacrilege, receive one part of the sacrament of the Eucharist without the other. For, either Gelasius erred in these two matters, or we are in error who have the opposite opinion and follow it.

I respond to the first part: that book is not the work of Pope Gelasius, but it is by Gannadius who wrote a book under that same title to Pope Gelasius; or it is the work of Gelasius, the bishop of Caesarea, whom Jerome mentions towards the end of his Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Authors; in fact, Gelasius wrote five books against Eutyches, as Trithemius reports; but this is only one book and it is very small. Then this author promises that he will gather together the opinions of almost all the ancients on the Incarnation of the Lord; and while he cites 15 Greek Fathers, he mentions only two Latins, Ambrose and Damasus, and he omits Cyprian, Hilary, Jerome, Augustine, Innocent, Leo, Prosper and others, whom Pope Gelasius never would have omitted, nor any other Latin author. For it seems to be clearly deduced from the above that this author

was a Greek, not a Latin; but whoever it was, we will have to show in book 2, chapter 27 on the sacrament of the Eucharist that his opinion is well founded. To the second point I say that Gelasius in that canon is speaking only about the sacrificing priest, who cannot without sacrilege consume only one species, because that would render the sacrifice imperfect.

The nineteenth is Anastasius II, who is accused of three errors. First, that without a council of bishops, priests and clerics of the whole Church, he communicated with Photinus, who had communicated with the heretic Acacius. Secondly, that he wanted secretly to recall Acacius, whom Popes Felix and Gelasius had condemned. Thirdly, that he approved baptisms and holy orders conferred by the same Acacius, because of which errors and sins the same Anastasius, by a divine action, having fallen sick, died suddenly. The pontifical author writes this in the life of this Anastasius, and Tilmann Heshusius followed him in book 1, chapter 9 on the Church, indeed also Gratian in dist. 19, and the Magdeburgenses in Centuries *6,* chapter 10 on the life of Anastasius.

I respond that it is false that Anastasius wanted to recall Acacius. For it is certain from Evagrius in book 3, chapter 23 and from Nicephorus in books 15 and 17, and from Liberatus in chapter 19 that Acacius died during the time of Pope Felix, and that Anastasius was two Popes after him. Therefore, how could Anastasius want to recall him to his previous position, since he had already died? But they say that he at least wanted to restore his name.

However, there is a letter of this Pope Anastasius to the Emperor Anastasius, in which he asks the Emperor to command that the name of Acacius be suppressed in the Church, since he had been justly condemned by his predecessor, Pope Felix. But Gratian in dist. 19 on the canon *"Ita Dominus"* says that Anastasius erred in this letter, because he wanted the sacraments of baptism and orders, which Acacius had conferred, to be held valid; this shows that Anastasius was not a heretic, but that Gratian was lacking in knowledge. For, who among Catholics does not know that those baptized by heretics truly are baptized, and similarly that the ordained are truly ordained, when the ordaining heretic truly was a bishop, and still was, at least with regard to the character?

What he says about Photinus perhaps is a lie, like the recall of Acacius; but if it is true, does that mean that Anastasius was not Catholic? Or is the Sovereign Pontiff without a council of all the bishops, priests and clergy of the whole Church not allowed to absolve someone excommunicated? What they add, namely, that Pope Anastasius died immediately through a special act of God, seems to have come from the certain fact that the heretical Emperor Anastasius, who lived at the same time, was struck by lightning and died, as is reported by Bede, Cedrenus, Zonarus, and Deacon Paul in the account of his life, otherwise there is no doubt that it is a fable.

The twentieth is Vigilius, whom Liberatus in chapter 22 of the Breviarium says wrote a letter to the Empress Theodora and other heretics, in which he confirmed their heresy, and pronounced an anathema on those who confess that there are two natures in Christ.

I respond: many think that this passage in Liberatus has been corrupted by heretics, because in the pontificate the contrary seems to be narrated. But since no trace of corruption appears in the book of Liberatus, and really the narration of Liberatus does

not conflict with the narration of the pontifical, it is necessary to give a different response. Therefore I say that Vigilius wrote that letter, and condemned the Catholic faith, at least by an exterior profession; but this is not an objection to our thesis. For, he did this while Pope Silverius was still living, at which time Vigilius himself was not Pope, but a pseudo-Pope, because there cannot be at the same time two true Sovereign Pontiffs; and it was clear to all at the time that Silverius was the true Pope, although he was living in exile.

For it should be known that the heretic Anthemius was deposed by the Roman Pontiff Agapitus from the episcopacy of Constantinople; then that the Empress petitioned Silverius, the successor of Agapitus, to restore Anthemius, which he refused to do; and next that Vigilius, an archdeacon, promised the Empress that he would recall Anthemius, if he could become the Roman Pontiff. Immediately, then, at the command of the Empress, through Belisarius, St. Silverius was deposed from his See and sent into exile; Vigilius was created Pope, or rather the anti-Pope. At the time it would not be surprising, if he could have erred in faith, and also been simply a heretic. Although not even then did he define anything against the faith as Pope, nor was he heretical in his thinking; and although he wrote an abominable letter unworthy of a Christian man, still in it he did not openly condemn the Catholic faith, nor did he speak with a heretical mind, but in a hidden way, because of his eager desire of presiding, as Liberatus says in the same place, and is apparent from the letter itself of Vigilius. For he wrote that they should take care lest anyone see his letter, and that eveiything should be kept secret for a time; for Vigilius then was in great difficulties in which his ambition had placed him. For, if he openly professed that he was a heretic, he feared the Romans, who would never accept a heretic sitting in the chair of Peter; on the other hand, if he professed himself to be Catholic, he feared the heretical Empress, with whose help he had acquired the pontificate. Therefore he came up with the idea to act as a Catholic in Rome, and in the meantime by his letter to seem to be a heretic in the eyes of the Empress.

But shortly thereafter it happened that Silverius died, and Vigilius, who until then was in a state of schism, now began to be the sole and legitimate Pontiff, indeed, even the Roman clergy and people confirmed him and accepted him. Then from this time no error or simulation of error was found in Vigilius, but with great constancy in the faith until his death, as it appears, with his pontificate he accepted the firmness of the faith, and was changed from light straw into a solid rock. For, when the heretical Empress Theodora, relying on the secret letter and the promise of Vigilius, asked him to restore the patriarch Anthemius, as he had promised, he answered her in writing that he had promised rashly and had gravely sinned by making that promise, and therefore that he could not and did not want to do what he had promised, lest sins be added to sins. Therefore he was sent into exile by the irate Empress, and was treated miserably until his death. This matter is not only written down in the pontifical, but it is also recorded by Deacon Paul in his life of Justinian, and Aimonius in book 3, chapter 32 on the deeds of the Franks, and even the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 6, chapter 10 on the life of Vigilius, and Liberatus also briefly recounts the same thing at the end of chapter 22, where he says that Vigilius was miserably treated later by the very same heresy, which in the beginning he had secretly favored.

Finally, all those who were living at the time and wrote something about Vigilius

bear witness that after the death of Silverius he was a true and holy Pontiff. Gregory I in book 2, letter 36 to the bishops of Ireland said: *Pope Vigilius of happy memory, established in the royal city, promulgated a decree of condemnation against the then August Theodora or the Acephali.* Cassiodorus in chapter 1 of the book on the divine lectionary said: *It is certain that the Origen of the present time was condemned by Pope Vigilius, a very holy man.* Arator, in the preface of the acts of the apostles, which he wrote in poetic form and dedicated to Pope Vigilius, begins in this way: *To the holy, blessed and apostolic Lord, and to the first of all priests in the world, Pope Vigilius.* Finally, it is certain from Evagrius in book 4, chapter 37 that the Fifth General Council was confirmed by Vigilius, in which that heresy was condemned, which Theodora favored, and of which Vigilius himself is accused by the adversaries.

It could also be said that the letter of Vigilius, which Liberatus mentions, was fabricated by heretics, and that Liberatus believed the false rumor which the heretics spread around. For, that the heretics fabricated a certain letter under the name of Vigilius to Theodora and Justininian was detected by certain traces in session 14 of the Sixth Council; but whether or not this is true, we are sufficiently certain that he erred in nothing, during the time he was the true Pontiff.

The twenty-first is St. Gregory I, who is accused of the error by Durandus in book 4, dist. 7, q. 4 that in book 3, letter 26 to John, the bishop of Cagliari he allowed priests to confer the sacrament of Confirmation, which by divine right only bishops can do. Because of this letter of Gregory, Hadrian in the last article on the question of Confirmation says that the Pontiff can err in defining the dogmas of faith.

I respond, first of all, that not St. Gregoiy, but rather Durandus and Hadrian have erred. Since the Council of Florence in the Decree for the Armenians, and Trent in session 7, canon 3 teach that the ordinary minister of Confirmation is a bishop, it follows from that extraordinarily that also a non-bishop can be the minister of this sacrament. Then, Gregoiy did not publish a decree on this matter, but only gave permission to some priests that they may confirm, when the bishop is absent; therefore, if Gregoiy erred in this matter, there was an error not of doctrine, but of a fact. There is also another error, which is attributed to Gregoiy, but falsely, and we will discuss it below when we treat Gregoiy III.

The twenty-second is Boniface V, whom the Magdeburgenses gravely reprimand in Centuries 7, chapter 10, because in his letter to Edwin, the King of England, which Bede recounts in book 2, chapter 10 of his history of England, he taught that Christ did not redeem us from original sin alone.

I respond that the Centuriatorians on their own initiative added that word "alone." For Boniface says this: *Therefore embrace the acknowledgement of him who created you, who breathed into you the spirit of life, who for your redemption sent his only-begotten Son in order to save you from original sin.* These are his words. The reason why he did not mention other sins was because original sin is the main point and it was in order to remove it principally that Christ died. Hence in John 1:36 and 29 we read: *Behold, the lamb of God. Behold him who takes away the sin of the world.* In Greek it is: την άμαρτίαν του κόσμου, the sin of the world, that is, original sin, which alone is common to the whole world, for many have nothing else, like infants and small children.

CHAPTER XI

ON HONORIUS I

The twenty-third is Honorius I, whom Nilus contends in his book on the primacy of the Roman Pontiff was a heretical Monothelite. The Magdeburgenses say the same thing in Centuries 7, chapter 10 on his life, and in chapter 11, col. 553 they place him among the manifest heretics. Not only heretics, but also some Catholics claim that Honorius was a heretic, like Melchior Cano in book 6, last chapter in his book on theological places. These are their arguments. First, from the letters of Honorius himself; for, there are two letters of Honorius to Sergius; one in session 12 of the Sixth Council, the other is in session 13 in the same place. In both of them Honorius approves the teaching of Sergius, the leader of the Monothelites, and he commands that it must not be said that Christ has two wills and two operations.

The second argument is from the Sixth Council, session 13, where Honorius is condemned as a heretic, and his letters are burned, and in all the subsequent actions the condemnation is repeated.

The third is from the last session of the Seventh Council, where the whole council proclaims an anathema on Honorius, Sergius, Cyrus, and other Monothelites, and it repeats the same thing in the letter that it wrote to all the clergy.

The fourth is from session 7 of the Eighth Council, where the letter of the Roman Council under Adrian II is read and approved, and where the Pontiff with the council says that Honorius was judged by the Sixth Council after his death, because he was accused of heresy.

The fifth is from the letter of Pope Agatho, who in his letter to the Emperor Constantine IV, which is found in the fourth session of the Sixth Council, published an anathema on Honorius as a Monothelite.

The sixth is from Leo II, who in a letter to the same Emperor, which is found at the end of the council, execrates the same Honorius, as one who had contaminated the apostolic See with his heresy.

The seventh is from various Greek and Latin authors, who testify that Honorius was a heretic. Tharasius, the bishop of Constantinople, asserts that in a letter to the patriarch, which is found in session 3 of the Seventh Council. Likewise the Catholic Deacon Epiphanius in a dispute with the heretic Gregory, which is found in session 6, tome 2 of the Seventh Council; Psellus in his song on the seven councils; Bede on the six ages in the life of Emperor Constantine IV, and in the pontifical book on the life of Leo II.

But those who wrote for Honorius were Albert Pighius in book 4, chapter 8 on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Hosius in book 2 against Brentius, and John a Lovanio in chapter 11 of the book on the perpetual protection of Peter, and Onuphrius in the Annotations to Platina on the life of Honorius; their reasons are much more convincing than those of the adversaries, as will become clear in our answer to the arguments.

Therefore, to the first argument I respond in two ways. First, perhaps those letters were faked, and inserted into the council by heretics; for, that this is not said rashly is

certain from the fact that in the Fifth Council the fictitious letters of the Roman Pope Vigilius and of Menna, the patriarch of Constantinople, were inserted by similar heretics. This was detected in sessions 12 and 14 of the Sixth Council, when the acts of the Fifth Council were being read again. For, three quaternaries were found to have been inserted by heretics, and those letters were among them. So why should we be surprised, if the same contrivers did the same thing in the Sixth Council?

Secondly I say: No error is contained in those letters of Honorius. For, in his letters Honorius confesses, pertaining to this matter, that there are two wills and two operations in Christ. He only forbids the names of one or two wills, which at the time were unheard of, and that was very prudent counsel. And that he confesses the matter itself is clear from the words of his second letter: *We must confess that each of the two natures, joined by a unity of nature in the one Christ, operates and acts in common with the other, that is, the divine performs what is of God, and the human accomplishes what is of the flesh: teaching that, without division and without confusion or alteration, the nature of God is transferred into man and the human is transferred into God, but confessing the complete differences of the natures, etc.* This confession is veiy Catholic, completely destroying the heresy of the Monothelites.

Now it is proved that Honorius by a prudent counsel forbade the use of the names of one or two operations. For then there was the beginning of this heresy, and nothing had been defined by the Church about these names. And then, for the first time, Cyrus of Alexandria had begun to preach that there is one operation in Christ; but on the other hand, Sophronius of Jerusalem, opposing Cyrus, preached that there are two operations in Christ. Cyrus referred this disagreement to Sergius of Constantinople, and both of them to the Roman Honorius. Therefore, Honorius fearing, something that happened later, lest this dispute should grow into a grave schism, and seeing at the same time that the faith could be saved without these words, wanted to reconcile both opinions and at the same time do away with the cause of scandal and contention. Therefore, he wrote in letter 1 that we should avoid using the word of one operation, lest we seem with the Eutychians to place one nature in Christ; and again, we should avoid the word of two operations, lest we seem with Nestorius to place two persons (in Christ): *Lest,* he said, *either offended by the word of two operations, they think we are following Nestorius and have gone mad, or certainly if again we are thought to have confessed one operation, we are thought to confess to shocked ears the stupid madness of the Eutychians.*

Then in letter 2, teaching the way of speaking and reconciling opinions, he said: *Eliminating, therefore... the scandal of the new invention, you should not preach by defining one or two operations; but, in place of the one operation, which some affirm, we should, in truth, profess the one Christ, the Lord, who acts in both natures; and in place of the two operations, and doing away with the term double operation, one should, rather, proclaim with us that the two natures themselves, namely, that of the divinity and of the flesh assumed, are operating according to what is proper to them in the one Person of the only begotten Son of God the Father, in a manner that is without confusion or division or change.* These words are found there and they are certainly worthy of praise.

But shortly after that he preaches only one will in these words: *Hence we confess*

one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, I respond that in that place Honorius was speaking only about the human nature, and he wanted to say that in the man Christ there were not two conflicting wills—one of the flesh and one of the spirit, but only one, that is, the spirit. For, the flesh in Christ sought absolutely nothing contrary to reason. But it is clear from the reason he gives that this was the mind of Honorius. For he says this: *Hence we confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ also, because surely our nature, not our guilt, was assumed by the Godhead, that certainly which was created before sin, not that which was vitiated after the transgression.* This reason means nothing, if it is used to prove that in Christ, God and man, there was only one will; but it is very convincing, if from it is to be proved that in Christ there were not contrary wills of flesh and spirit; for that contrariety is born of sin, but Christ has human nature without sin.

Then, because someone could raise an objection from these texts of the gospel: *I have not come to do my own will;* and, *not my will but thine be done.* There it seems that Christ as man had contrary wills, that is, one bad, which did not want to suffer, and one good, by which he willed that his prior will not be fulfilled, but that the contrary should be fulfilled, which was in conformity with the will of God. Honorius responds a little bit after that: *It is written: I have not come to do my will, but the will of him who sent me, the Father,* and, *Not what I will, but what you will, Father, and other words of this kind. These are not different wills, but dispositions of the assumed humanity. For, those things were said on our behalf, whereby he gave us an example that we should follow his footsteps, a pious teacher forming his disciples, so that each one of us will prefer in all things not his own will, but rather the will of the Lord:* that is, Christ did not have contrary wills, so that it was necessary for him to conquer and mortify one of them; but he does speak as if he had contrary wills to teach us to mortify our own will, which tends often to rebel against God.

And this is confirmed by the important testimony of St. Maximus, who lived at the time of Honorius. For, he wrote a dialogue against Pyrrhus, the successor of Sergius, which is still in the Vatican library. In the dialogue he introduces the heretical Pyrrhus claiming for himself the testimony of Honorius; then he responds that Honorius was always Catholic; and then he proves it both from other sources, and from the testimony of the secretary himself of Honorius, who wrote down the letters dictated by Honorius, and he says that this secretary was still living at that time. But the secretary testified that the mind of Honorius never was to deny two wills in Christ, and if at times he seems to deny two, that is to be understood as being about two contrary and conflicting wills in the same human nature, which are found in us because of sin, but in Christ they did not exist. Now we will quote the very words of St. Maximus.

Pyrrhus. *What do you want to say about Honorius, who in the letters, which he wrote to Sergius some time ago, professed only one will of our Lord Jesus Christ?* Maximus. *There is one very true and certain interpreter of these letters, namely his secretary, who in the name of Honorius wrote them, especially since the same man is still living, and he honors parts of the whole West with the splendor of every virtue and with the practice of religion; or is it about the citizens of Constantinople, who say nothing except what pleases them?* Pyrrhus. *What he wrote is truer.* Maximus. *But he wrote to the Emperor*

Constantine in this way about that letter at the command of the Pontiff John. Surely what ive *said about the one will of our Lord, should not be understood as if it were said about the two wills of the divine and human natures, but of the human nature only. For since Sergius wrote that some priests are preaching that there are two contrary will in Christ, we wrote back that Christ does not have two contrary wills.*

Finally, since in the whole letter Honorius contends that it is not to be said that in Christ, God and man, there is one, but two wills; why is he forgetting himself and confessing so openly one will? Therefore he did not say there is one will of the God-man, but one will of the man only, as also the following words and the secretaiy testify. Therefore in these letters we find no error.

To the second point I say that doubtless the name of Honorius, among those who are condemned in the Sixth Council, was inserted by the enemies of the Roman Church, and this goes also for whatever else is said there against Honorius. I prove this first of all, because Anastasius, the librarian, testifies to this in his history concerning the Greek Theophane Isaurus.

Secondly, because it was almost the usual custom of the Greeks to corrupt books. For (as we have said) in this very same Sixth Council, in sessions 12 and 14, they discovered several corruptions made by the heretics in the Fifth Council. And Leo in letter 83 to Palestinus complains about the Greeks that they had corrupted his letter to Flavian, while he was still living. Gregory in book 5, letter 14 to Narsemus says that the men from Constantinople corrupted the Council of Chalcedon, and that they were suspected of having done the same thing at Ephesus. And he adds that the Roman codices are much more reliable than the Greek. *Because,* he said, *just as the Romans do not have trickery, so they do not practice deceit.*

Finally, Nicholas I in his letter to Michael, referring the Emperor to the letter of Adrian, said: *But if it was sent not in the falsified way of the Greeks, but as it came from the apostolic See, it is preserved until now in the possession of the Constantinople Church.* And he said this not without reason; for, the things he says are included in the letter to Photius, taken from the letter of Adrian to Tharasius, are not found in that letter as it was read at the Seventh Council. For, the Greeks removed that section, because it was against the honor of Tharasius. Therefore, if the Greeks corrupted the Third, Fourth, Fifth and Seventh Councils, why should we be surprised if they also corrupted the Sixth? This is especially so, since it is certain that shortly after the conclusion of the Sixth Council, many bishops again went to Constantinople and published the Trullan canons, and it seems that the purpose of these bishops was nothing other than to berate and reprimand the Roman Church.

Thirdly, because the Council could not condemn Honorius as a heretic without contradicting the letter of St. Agatho. For, Pope Agatho in letter 1 to the Emperor, which was read in session 4 of the Council, said the following: *This is the rule of true faith, which this spiritual mother of your tranquil empire, the apostolic Church of Christ, vigorously has held in good times and in bad, and defends. By the grace of almighty God it will be proved that she has never wandered from the path of apostolic tradition, nor has she been corrupted or succumbed to the heretical novelties; but, as from the beginning*

of the Christian faith she has been guided by her authors, the princes of the apostles of Christ; she will remain uncorrupted until the end, according to the divine promise of the Lord and Savior himself, which he made to the prince of his disciples in the holy gospel, saying, Peter, Peter, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail; and when you have turned again, strengthen your brethren. Therefore, your tranquil majesty should consider how the Lord and Savior of all, who promised that Peter's faith would never fail, told him to strengthen his brethren, and that everyone knows that the apostolic Pontiffs, the predecessors of my humble self, have always done that.

You should note here that Agatho not only says that the faith in the See of Peter has not failed, and that it cannot fail, and therefore that the Pontiff as Pontiff cannot decree something contrary to the faith, but also that all his predecessors, of whom Honorius is one, have always resisted heresies and confirmed the brethren in the true faith. And after that, after Agatho had mentioned the heretical Monothelites, Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, Peter and Theodore, he says: *Therefore with great effort the holy Church of God must be freed and liberated from the errors of such teachers, so that all the bishops, clergy and people will confess and preach with us the evangelical and apostolic rectitude of the orthodox faith, which is founded on the solid rock of St. Peter, prince of the apostles and of the Church, which by his grace and protection remains uncontaminated by any error.* This letter was approved by the whole council in session 8 and they said that blessed Peter spoke through Agatho.

Based on the above, therefore, I argue as follows. If Honorius was a heretical Monothelite, why does Agatho, when arguing about this heresy, write that none of his predecessors had ever erred? And since the other Churches were contaminated by the errors of their bishops, only the Roman Church remained unstained? Then, if the council confesses that Peter spoke through Agatho, and said that the Roman Pontiffs have always strengthened their brethren in the faith, and never succumbed to heresies, it is with great temerity that the same council in a single action declares an anathema on the heretical Honorius. Therefore it is necessary that either the council was falsified, or the letter of Agatho, or the council is in conflict with itself and with Agatho. But no one has ever asserted this last point, not even the heretics; about the second there never was any suspicion; therefore it is necessary to hold the first alternative.

Nilus attempts to respond to this argument, but in vain: *Perhaps,* he said, *Agatho was moved by the fact that the nature of the question then demanded that; as often happens, so that he wrote that really the Church rarely departed from the truth.* Those are his words.

But the nature of the question demanded that Agatho should say something on his own authority and in praise of his predecessors. But did it require that he lie shamelessly? And was it not an impudent lie, what Agatho said, that all his predecessors always resisted the heretics, if Honorius was contaminated with the very same heresy about which he was then speaking? And it is not sufficient that the Roman Church erred rarely, in order to be able to say that she never erred. But let us hear something more: *Otherwise,* Nilus said, *if so simply, and without any exception, it were true (that none of the Roman Pontiffs erred), how would that saying be true: They have all gone astray, they are all alike*

corrupt; there is none that does good, no, not one?

Surely that is an excellent reason, as if David is speaking about faith, and not about morals. But the Psalm does not say, *There is no one who believes well,* but, *There is none that does good. We all make many mistakes,* James says. Otherwise, if he were speaking about faith, it would have been necessary also for Paul, and John and all the apostles to err, even after having received the Holy Spirit.

Nilus goes on: *It could rightly be said here that Agatho was speaking about past ages, that is, that in them the Roman Church did not err, not about the future ages, that it is impossible that she could ever fall into error.* But Honorius, my good Nilus, lived in a previous age; for, he preceded Agatho by many years, and then does not Agatho say about the future that the faith in the See of Peter will never fail?

Nilus adds this finally: *Certainly before the Sixth Council Agatho wrote those letters, and then he did not know well the matters about which the Sixth Council was dealing. So it would not be very surprising, if the holy Council perceived those things that one man alone could not sufficiently understand.*

But if that is true, then Agatho erred out of ignorance. Therefore, why did the whole Council in sessions 8 and 18 approve that letter as having been written by Peter? What is this other than to say that such a great Council either approved an error, or openly contradicted itself? I will ignore that, but the dogmas of Honorius were known absolutely better to no one than to Agatho, since the case itself had been examined often by Pope John IV, Martin I, and other predecessors of Agatho, and successors of Honorius.

Fourthly it is proved from the letter of Nicholas to Michael, where Nicholas sayi about the Roman Pontiffs: *For not even the slightest rumor has tainted them—that with the wise ones they have thought base things and even less uttered them.* These are his words. But how is this true, if in a public, well known and crowded council an anathema was often declared on the heretic Honorius?

Fifthly it is proved, because either it is necessary to say that this Council, where it condemns Honorius, has been corrupted by enemies, or it is necessary to assert that this same Council is guilty of an intolerable error and impudence; but not even the heretics have ever affirmed this second alternative; therefore the first one must be affirmed. But from this it is certain that the Council could not, without intolerable impudence and error, condemn Honorius for heresy, because the Council did not have any proof of the heresy of Honorius, except from his letters to Sergius, where Honorius forbids speaking about one or two operations in Christ. He wanted only to abstain from using those designations of "one" or "two" in order to avoid scandal and to put an end to the strife. For, he cannot be condemned as a heretic who confesses the reality itself, although for a good reason he thinks that certain words should be avoided, especially before a definition of the Church. Otherwise, St. Jerome could also be condemned as a heretic, because in his letter to Damasus he thought that three hypostases should not be affirmed in God, and afterwards the Church defined the contrary of that more than once.

Finally, there is also the fact that in the large Roman synod, which was celebrated before the Sixth Council by St. Martin I, Pope and martyr, concerning this matter of the Monothelites, Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus and Paul were condemned by name; but no

mention was made of Honorius. This cannot be attributed to a favoring of persons, since those bishops were holy men, and especially St. Martin, who presided over the synod, can much less be accused of ignorance or forgetfulness. For, who knew better the acts of the Pontiffs than their successors? Therefore, if the Roman synod did not condemn Honorius, which had the original copies of his letters, and living witnesses of his words and deeds, how credible is it that the Sixth general Council would condemn him from his letters alone?

But if someone still is not ready to believe that the Sixth Council was corrupted, he may accept another solution, which is that of John a Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 93 of his book on the Church. He teaches that the Fathers of the Sixth Council did indeed condemn Honorius, but based on false information, and therefore that they erred in that judgment. For although a legitimate general council cannot err, as the sixth did not err, in defining the dogmas of faith, still it can err in questions of fact. Therefore we can safely say that these Fathers were deceived by false rumors, and not understanding the letters of Honorius, they numbered Honorius undeservedly among the heretics.

You will say: Therefore you understand the letters of Honorius better than so many Fathers? I respond that it is not by me, but by John IV, Martin I, Agatho, and Nicholas I, Sovereign Pontiffs, and by the whole Roman synod assembled by Martin I, that those letter were better understood than they were by the Greeks in the Sixth Council.

Therefore why, you will ask, did the legates of Agatho not protest loudly, when Honorius was condemned? I respond that it was done in order to avoid a greater evil. For the legates feared, if they protested, lest the definition of the true faith would be impeded, and that the schism could not be removed, which had already lasted for 60 years. For, at that Council many patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch were condemned; their successors would not easily agree to this, unless also Honorius were condemned, who had been accused together with them. This is enough on the second argument.

To the third I respond that the Fathers of the Seventh Council followed the Sixth, and only repeated what they read in it. Therefore they were deceived by the Sixth Council, which either was corrupted or condemned Honorius on the basis of an error.

To the fourth I respond that Adrian with the Roman synod does not clearly say that Honorius was a heretic, but only that he received an anathema from the Orientals, because he had been accused of heresy. There Adrian seems to have said that Honorius was anathematized by the Orientals, because he knew that he had not been anathematized by the Western bishops, that is, by the synod of St. Martin. But Adrian added, also in the case of Honorius that the Orientals did not dare to pass sentence on Honorius, unless the consent of the Roman Church had been given, because he knew that the legates of Agatho had agreed to the condemnation of Honorius. And we say this, if the acts of the Sixth Council are defended as genuine; for if we say they have been corrupted, it will be necessaiy to respond that Adrian was deceived by those corrupted acts of the Sixth Council.

You will say: But certainly those councils believed that the Pope can err, since they believed Honorius was a heretic. I respond that those Fathers believed only that the Pope can en as a private person, which is a probable opinion, although the contrary seems to

us more probable. For, this is what Honorius is accused of—that he favored heresy in his private letters.

To the fifth argument I say that Cano erred twice in his argument. First, when he says that Agatho pronounced an anathema on Honorius; for, this is found nowhere in the letters of Agatho. But Cano seems to have been deceived by the acts of the council; for, the author of the acts of the councils against faith in those letters, which are contained in full in volume 2 of the councils, adds the name of Honorius. Then he is wrong when he says that this letter of Agatho was written to the Sixth Council, because both letters of Agatho were written to the Emperor, not to the council.

To the sixth argument I say that the letter of Leo was corrupted by the same persons, by whom the Sixth Council was corrupted, because that letter is thought to be a part of the council, and it is included in that council. Certainly Leo followed the judgment of Agatho's legates, in order not to disturb the agreement already reached. But we are not bound to follow Leo more than so many other Sovereign Pontiffs, especially in a question of fact, which does not pertain to the faith.

To the seventh argument: I oppose authors to authors, the many to the few, and ancients to modems. For, first of all, St. Maximus, who lived during the time of Honorius, in the Dialogue against Pyrrhus Theophanes Isaurus in the history which Onuphrius cites, and Emanuel Calleca in the book which he wrote for the Latins against the Greeks, testify that Honorius was always Catholic. Then Photius, also a Greek, and hostile to the Roman Church in his book on the seven councils, when he comes to the Sixth Council says that Cyrus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and Peter were condemned; but he says no such thing about Honorius. Similarly, Zonaras in the life of Constantine IV, when citing the names of those condemned at the Sixth Council, omits Honorius. Deacon Paul does the same thing in his life of the same Constantine IV. Finally, almost all the Latin historians, like Bede, Anastasius the librarian, Blondus in book 9, Decad. 1, Nauclerus, Sabellicus Platina and others, portray Honorius as a holy and Catholic Pontiff.

I added Bede, even though Cano disagrees; for, I do not doubt that he thought the same, although the name of Honorius, in his book on the six ages, crept into ιζ among those who are thought to have been condemned by the Sixth Council. For, it seems that a superficial scholar added the name of Honorius in Bede's book, because in the Sixth Council eveiywhere it is found with the names of Cyrus, Sergius, etc. For, that Bede considered Honorius to be a holy man, also after his death, is clear both from book 2, chapters 17-19 in his history of the English people, where he often speaks about Honorius as an excellent pastor, and from the life of the Abbot St. Bertolfus, where he calls Honorius, now blessed, now holy, and among other things he also says: *Honorius was a venerable bishop, wise in his thinking, strong in giving counsel, clear in doctrine, distinguished for his sweetness and humility.* And after that: *The holy Pope offered the desired office to the mentioned father Bertolfus, namely, the privileges of the apostolic See, inasmuch as none of the bishops in the previously mentioned cloister attempted to rule in any way.* These are Bede's words about Honorius; certainly he would not have said such things, if he considered him to be a condemned heretic, as the adversaries claim.

CHAPTER XII

ON SEVEN OTHER PONTIFFS

The twenty-fourth Roman Pontiff among those who are said to have erred is St. Martin I, whom the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 7, chapter 20 accuse because in his letter to Amandus he taught that forgiveness should not be given to priests and deacons who have sinned after their ordination, which seems to be a type of Novatianism.

I respond: Martin is not talking about the forgiveness of sins, but about restoration to the sacred ministries. For he wants priests and deacons, who have sinned gravely, to be deposed from their grade; and if they have a change of heart, and ask for forgiveness, they are to be absolved from their sins, but never to be restored to their position, which is the same thing all the ancients taught.

The twenty-fifth is Gregory III, whom the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 8, chapter 10 accuse in the section on his life. First, because in his letter to Boniface he ordered that those ordained by others, than by those whom the Roman Pontiff sent, are to be consecrated again. But this is a clear lie. For, Gregory orders only that those are to be consecrated again who were ordained by those who are not true bishops.

Secondly, they accuse Martin because in another letter to Boniface he permitted a man to take another wife, if because of some illness his own wife is not able to have conjugal relations; but this is expressly against the gospel, as Gratian also noted in 32, question 7, canon "Quod proposuisti." Gregory I is accused by some of the same error because of his letter to Augustine, a bishop in England, in which similar words are found.

I respond first of all that it is amazing why the Lutherans consider this to be an error, since Luther also taught this, according to the testimony of John Cochlaeus in his chapter on matrimony. Then I say: Gregory is not speaking about any kind of weakness, but about perpetual and natural impotence, because of which the woman is incapable of marriage; for such marriages, if they were contracted out of error, are considered to be invalid, and they are dissolved by a judgment of the Church, as we have in the decretal under the title of frigidity; this is the response of the Gloss in 20 dist. in the canon on petitions.

But on the contrary there is this: Gregory seems to judge that the first marriage was valid, and that it is not dissolved, but a second one is added to it; for, he writes that the man must not remove support from his first wife, that is, that he must still nourish and support her as his wife. Therefore it could also be said with the same Gloss in 32, question 7, canon "Quod proposuisti" that the Pontiff is giving counsel, not a precept, that he should still support the woman who seemed to be his wife, if she needs his care, since it happened by no fault of him, that she could not be his wife. But it is to be noted that this decision is not that of Gregory I, but only of Gregory III. For, that letter to Augustine is one and the same as the letter to Boniface, which certainly came from Gregory III; hence it is not found among the works of St. Gregory, but only in the tomes of the councils. There also the Roman council on the prohibited grades of matrimony is attributed to Gregory I and III, but really it could belong only to Gregory III, as is clear from the mention of the emperors, who are named as the beginning and the end of the council.

The twenty-sixth is Nicholas I, whom some reprimand, because he taught (as is said about consecration, dist. 4, canon "A quodam Judaeo") that baptism conferred in the name of Jesus without the express mention of the three persons is valid. For this is contrary not only to the gospel, but also to the decrees of other Pontiffs; indeed, to the decrees of Pelagius and Zachary, who reject the baptism of those who have been baptized only in the name of Christ, and not expressly in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, as is clear in the same dist. 4, canon "Multi" and the canon "In synodo." And it cannot be responded that at the time of Nicholas it had not yet been defined whether baptism was invalid, if it is conferred in the name of Christ. For, it had been defined in the English council, and was confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff Zachary, who preceded Nicholas, as is clear from the canon "In synodo," on consecration dist. 4.

I respond that Nicholas said that not as defining a question of faith, but only as a particular doctor he gave expression in passing of his own opinion. For, what he intended to teach in that canon was not something on the form of baptism, but only on the minister, about whom he had been interrogated. Therefore, after he had responded and defined that the baptism is valid, even if it is conferred by a Jew or a pagan, which was precisely the question, in passing he added: Baptism is valid whether it is conferred in the name of the three persons, or in the name of Christ only. In this matter he followed the opinion of Ambrose in book 1, chapter 3 on the Holy Spirit, as he says in the same place. In my opinion this position is false, but not heretical. For, no certain definition of the Church on this matter is to be found.

The canons of Pelagius and Zachary are not an obstacle to this. For, Pelagius does not define anything, but only as a doctor he explains his opinion in the letter to Gaudentius. But the canon of Zachary in my opinion is very suspect. For, first of all, Gratian cites the letter of Zachary to Boniface, when he states this canon; but such an opinion is not found in the letters of Zachary to Boniface, which exist in the tomes of the councils.

Then Bede in the history of his people does not mention that English council, but in the same place he often mentions the other English councils. In fact, Bede himself follows the contrary opinion. For, in chapter 10 of his Acts he approves the opinion of Ambrose on baptism in the name of Christ. However, he could not have ignored the decree of the English council, if it really existed, and which Zachary mentioned, since he lived at the same time of Zachary and lived after Zachary. And it is not in any way credible that he wanted to contradict a council held in his own country and confirmed by the apostolic See.

However, if we admit the authority of the council, and of Zachary, two responses can be made. First, with the Master in 4, dist. 2 that in that council it was defined only that a baptism is not valid without the invocation of the three divine persons; however, it was not defined whether those three persons must be named implicitly or explicitly; and therefore that canon does not contradict the opinion of Ambrose and Nicholas, who taught that the implicit naming of the three persons in the one name of Christ suffices. In this way also that canon of the council was understood by St. Bernard in letter 340 and by Hugh of St. Victor and by all the other doctors of that period who, notwithstanding the canon of the English council, taught that baptism in the name of Christ is valid.

Secondly, it can be said that the English council was not truly and properly approved by the apostolic See; and therefore it did not decide anything about the faith. For, Zachaiy praised the English council, and cited its decrees for his own proposal, but he did not really as Pontiff approve the acts of that council with the intention of confirming it. For, it is one thing for the Pontiff seriously to confirm the decrees of councils, but it is something else to commend them for some other purpose.

The twenty-seventh is Stephen VI, to whom is joined the twenty-eighth about Sergius III; for, as is certain from Platina and others, Pope Stephen revoked the acts of his predecessor Pope Formosus, and also he ordered those ordained by him to be ordained again; therefore he thought that the sacrament depends on the virtue of the minister, which is a manifest error in faith. Therefore John IX afterwards revoked the acts of Stephen VI, and approved the acts of Formosus. But again shortly thereafter Sergius III again revoked the acts of Formosus, and therefore those of John, and he approved the acts of Stephen. Of these Pontiffs, contradicting each other, necessarily some of them erred, as the Magdeburgenses carefully point out in Centuries 9, chapter 10 on the life of Stephen VI, and in Centuries 10, chapter 10 on the life of John IX and the life of Sergius III.

I respond that Stephen VI and Sergius III erred, but in a question of fact, not of right, and by bad example, not by false doctrine; for, here is the history. Formosus, Cardinal and bishop of Portuensis, deposed, degraded, and reduced to the lay state by Pope John VIII, departed from Rome and swore that he would never return to the city or to the episcopacy. Shortly thereafter John VIII died, and his successor Martin II absolved Formosus from the oath he had made rashly, and he restored him to his previous dignity. Not long after that the same Formosus was elected Pope, lived for five years, and then went to his fathers.

Stephen VI succeeded him. He was motivated by a great hatred for Formosus, and either not knowing, or not believing that he had been absolved by Pope Martin of his oath, he decreed publicly in a council of bishops that Formosus never was a legitimate Pontiff, and therefore that all of his acts must be declared invalid, and those who had received sacred orders from him, he forced to be ordained again, as if they had received nothing from him. This matter displeased everyone; therefore the three Pontiffs succeeding in order, Romanus, Theodore II, and especially John IX, having convoked a council of bishops, judged that Formosus was a true Pontiff, and they revoked the decree of Stephen VI. Afterwards Sergius III succeeded and in every way he imitated Stephen VI. Therefore, the main question was whether Formosus was a legitimate Pope or not. We do not deny that in such questions Pontiffs can err, and de facto that Stephen and Sergius were in error.

But you will object: Stephen and Sergius not only judged that Formosus was not a true Pontiff, but also that the sacred orders, which he conferred, were not valid; this is a manifest error against the faith. For, even if Formosus was not Pope, and always remained deposed and degraded, nevertheless, because at one time he was a true bishop, and possessed the character and power of orders, which cannot in any way be lost, it is an error in faith to say that the sacred orders conferred by him were not true sacred orders.

I respond that Stephen and Sergius did not publish a decree by which they decided

that those ordained by a degraded bishop, or especially by the degraded Formosus, are to be re-ordained, but they only de facto ordered that they should be ordained again. This command did not proceed from ignorance, or heresy, but from hatred for Famosus. For, Sigebert notes in the Chronicle for the year 903 that Stephen VI, while almost all were protesting against it, by force re-ordained those who had been ordained by Formosus.

The twenty-ninth is John XIII or, as others say XIV, whom the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 10, chapter 6, col. 294 accuse of a horrendous error and sacrilege, because contrary to the institution of Christ, he began to baptize bells, which also frequently other heretics raise as an objection against us. But it is surprising, why they do not also say that the bells were previously catechized by us, and instructed, so that they might resonate the creed of the faith.

Therefore, they reprimand us either for the action itself or for the name of the baptism of bells. If the action, they are clearly confused or they are lying; for the bells are not really baptized, but they are only blessed and dedicated to divine worship, in the way in which temples, altars, chalices, and other sacred vessels are blessed, as is clear from the pontifical, where the blessing of bells is contained, and nowhere is there any mention of baptism, nor is it said: *I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.* But there only prayers to God are found, as in other blessings. If they are blaming the name, they should know that the name of baptism does not come from the Pontiffs, but from the common people, and it is accommodated metaphorically to the blessing of bells, because they see that the bells are sprinkled with water.

The thirtieth is Sylvester II, whom Martin Polonus in the Chronicle claims was a magician and necromancer, and was torn to pieces by the devil in the Church of the Holy Cross in Jerusalem. The Magdeburgenses in Centuries 10 and Tilmann in book 1, chapter 9 on the Church agree with him about this. But it is certain that necromancers, for the most part, are infidels, and that they worship the devil as God.

I respond that without doubt such stories are fables, which are told about magic and the death of Sylvester II. For, no ancient, reputable author affirms this as a certainty, and there still exists in the Lateran Basilica the tomb of this Pontiff, with an epitaph placed there by Pope Sergius IV, a holy man according to all the authors, who was the Pope only five years after Sylvester; in that epitaph Sylvester is praised as an excellent Pontiff. The occasion for inventing the fable about his being a magician, was because Sylvester was very expert in geometry, and he also wrote books about it. But in that century, that is the tenth century, when anyone who dedicated himself to mathematics or philosophy was considered by the common people to be a magician. For more on this see Onuphrius in his notes on Platina.

CHAPTER XIII

ON GREGORY VII

The thirty-first, who is accused of error by the adversaries, is Gregory VII. For the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 11, chapter 10 blame him as being heretical, necromantic, seditious, simoniacal, adulterous, and the worst, not only of all Pontiffs, but almost of all men. And therefore they do not call him Gregory, as he was called in the pontificate, nor Hildebrand, as he was called before he became Pope, but Hellebrand, which in German means the fire of hell.

Theodore Bibliander in his Chronicle says that the same Gregory is Gog himself, the prince of Magog; and all the other present-day heretics detest no Pontiff more than him, and especially Tilmann in book 1 on the Church, where he openly lies that the evil things narrated about Gregory VII are contained in the books of the monks and of the flatterers of the Pope. But Tilmann himself and the Centuriatorians offer no witness except one, who was a sworn enemy of Gregory VII, and they prove everything from the testimony of one man named Benno, a pseudo-cardinal, who lived at that time and wrote a life of Gregory VII.

But while reading the book of this Benno, and finding it full of shameless lies, I was convinced that it manifests one of two things: either that Benno really wrote no such thing at that time, but that some Lutheran is the author of this book, who published it under the name of Benno, or certainly that that Benno did not so much write a life of Gregoiy VII, as under the name of Gregoiy VII he wanted to portray the idea of the worst possible Pontiff, in a way similar to Xenophon, who wrote the life of Cyrus, the king of the Persians, and who wrote not so much what Cyrus did, as what the ideal king should do.

It is evident that no faith is to be put in this Benno, because all the other authors, who at the time published something about this matter, contradicted him; so more trust should be put in them rather than in Benno, both because they are many, and he is only one, and also because Benno was created a cardinal not by the true Pope, Gregory VII, as Bibliander says falsely in Chronicle, tablet 13; he also says that Benno was a cardinal of Gregory VII and was his intimate friend; but he was named a cardinal by the anti-pope Clement III, whom the Emperor had established out of hatred for Gregory, as is clear from the book of Onuphrius on the Pontiffs; for since he was a cardinal of the anti-pope, he could not speak well about the true Pope. But the other authors were not hampered by either side because of some benefit; therefore they judged the matter more correctly. It can be demonstrated easily that what the others wrote is contrary to what Benno wrote.

Everything Benno wrote can be reduced to four points. The first is that Gregoiy VII by military force, which he hired for himself with money, invaded the pontificate without the approval of any cardinal, and without the consent of the clergy and the people. But St. Anselm, bishop of Lucca, who was living at the time, in a letter to Guibertus, who was in schism as the anti-pope and was called Clement III, wrote the following: *Therefore I will say about blessed Gregory our father, what St. Cyprian wrote about Cornelius: he*

was made bishop by the Judgment of God and of Christ and of almost all the clergy; and, in order to speak more truly, by the testimony of almost all, and by the vote of the people who were present, and of the older priests, and by the assembly of good men, since no one before him was made Pope, and since the place of Alexander II, that is, the place of Peter, and the seat of the sacerdotal chair was empty, etc. The Abbot Urspergensis quotes this letter and he adds that this Anselm was a very learned and holy man, so that in life and in death he was distinguished by miracles.

The form of the election of this Pontiff exists in Platina in these words: *We cardinals of the Roman Church, clerics, acolytes, subdeacons, priests, in the presence of bishops, abbots and many others both of the ecclesiastical and lay order, today on May 10, in the Basilica of St. Peter in Chains, in the year of salvation 1073 elected to be the true vicar of Christ, the Archdeacon Hildebrand, a man of great learning, of great piety, prudence, justice, constancy, religion, modesty, sobriety, continence, etc.* It seems that by divine providence this form was preserved to refute the lies of Benno. All the other authors, whom we will cite below, write the same thing.

Then Benno writes that the innocent Henry IV was excommunicated by Gregory VII and the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 11, chapter 6, col. 264 dare to say the same thing. But Stephen, the bishop of Halberstadt, a holy and learned man, at that time wrote these words to bishop Walramus, according to Dodechinus in the Additions to Marianus Scotus in the year 1090, and Trithemius in his Chronicle: *Listen to true words, not false, listen to strong words, not weak ones: everyone who sells spiritual offices is a heretic (simoniacal). But the Lord Henry, whom they call a king, sold bishoprics and abbeys. He sold Constance, Bamberg, Mainz and many others for money; Regensburg, Augsburg and Strasburg for military assistance; the Abbey of Fulda for adultery; and he sold a monastery and a bishopric, and it is a shame to even say or hear such a thing, for acts of sodomy. If you want to deny these things shamefully, nevertheless heaven and earth bear witness to them, and all the simple, ordinary people conclude that the Lord Henry is a heretic. For these wicked deeds he was excommunicated by the apostolic See, and he cannot exercise any power over us, because we are Catholics.* These are his words.

Marianus Scotus, who lived during the time of Henry IV, in the Chronicle for the year 1075 said: *Seeing these and similar abominable and unheard of crimes of king Henty, and hearing that they were done by a Catholic man at that time in the Church, with the prophet Elijah being zealous with the zeal of the Lord for the house of Israel, these things were sent to Rome by direct messengers to Alexander, who then occupied the apostolic Chair; many other things were said and done in the Teutonic kingdom by mad simoniacal heretics at the direction and support of king Henry; both in writing and vocally these things have been bewailed with groans of sorrow.*

Likewise Dodechinus continuing the work of Marianus in the year 1106 said: *It is very certain that Henry, a wicked man, by a just judgment was expelled from the Church, because he sold all spiritual things.* But the same author in the years 1090 and 1093 reports the many horrendous crimes of Henry IV. Also St. Anselm of Canterbury, an author at that same time, in a letter to Walram, which is at the beginning of his book on Easter, calls Henry IV the successor of Nero, Domitian and Diocletian. Finally, not a few crimes

of Heniy are mentioned by Abbot Lambert of Schaffnaburg, Albert Krantius in book 5 on Saxony, and John Aventinus in book 5 in the Annals of Bojorum; the Magdeburgenses are wont to rely heavily on these authors. But what is it that Calvin himself says about this? For he writes the following in book 4, chapter 11 § 13 in his Institutes: *The Emperor Heniy IV, a swift and imprudent man, avoiding counsel, very audacious and leading a dissolute life, had the bishops of all Germany under his control, partly because they were bought, partly because they were his captives.*

Thirdly, Benno writes that Pope Gregory was a Berengarian heretic, that is, that he certainly did not believe that the true Body of Christ is present in the Eucharist; now certainly nothing worse could be said about this Pontiff. For (I will omit that he is called holy by all the authors, that he always agreed with Leo IX and Nicholas II, who condemned Berengarius, that no approved author, not even Sigebert, who had little regard for him, dared to assert such a thing) this Gregory himself in the council of Tours, while presiding as the legate of the Sovereign Pontiff, rebuked the same Berengarius. For, Guitmundus in book 3 on the Eucharist writes the following: *She* (the Church) *through blessed Pope Leo condemned immediately at its beginning these Berengarian fictions. Then through this same man, who now presides as blessed Pope Gregory, at the time as the archdeacon of the same Roman See at the synod of Tours convicted and, it seems, corrected Berengarius himself, and making amends for the sacrament of his own hand, he received it. Somewhat thereafter, when Berengarius had returned to his own vomit, while representing Pope Nicholas of blessed memory at the general synod of Rome he condemned him again.*

And lest they say that Gregory, when he was archdeacon, was Catholic, but in his pontificate he became a heretic, let them read Thomas Waldensis in tome 2, chapter 43 on the sacrament, where he repeats verbally the decision of Pope Gregory VII, which he declared at the Roman synod against Berengarius in the sixth year of his pontificate, from which the lie of Benno will appear clearer than light.

Fourthly, Benno writes that Gregory was a terrible man, simoniacal, a magician, an adulterer, a murderer, and finally guilty of all evils; and he tells some stories about him, of which there are no traces in good authors, but which Illyricus and Tilmann proclaim as oracles.

But almost all other authors at that very time and in subsequent centuries wrote the contrary; and, to quote just the Germans, Trithemius in his Chronicle writes in this way about the public assembly of the emperor: *Gulielmus, the Abbot of Hirsaugiensis, was invited to this assembly of malicious people and he refused to go, because he knew the vicar of Christ was holy and innocent.* Otto Frisingensis in book 6, chapter 32 of his history said; *Hildebrand was always very steady in ecclesiastical sternness.* And in chapter 34 he said: *What he taught by word he demonstrated by his example, and being a strong fighter for all good things, he did not fear to make himself a solid wall in the house of the Lord.* And in chapter 36: *The Church, deprived of such a pastor who among all the priests and Roman Pontiffs was a man of outstanding zeal and authority, had no small sorrow.* Krantius in book 5, chapter 20 in Metropolis said: *Henry IV violated the rights of the Churches, and when installing and removing bishops according to his own wishes, he reproached the Sovereign Pontiff, Gregory VII, a holy man.*

The Abbot Urspergensis seems not to have dared to praise Gregoiy VII too openly, but in three places he indicates his opinion. First, where in veiy clear words he blames Henry IV: *In the year of the Lord 1068,* he said, *King Henry relying on the freedom of his youth, began to live in Saxony alone out of the whole Roman Empire, to despise the princes, to oppress the nobles, to elevate inferiors, to dedicate himself to hunting, to games, and to similar things, rather than taking care of his duties, as he has been accused.* And after that: *This is the end, this is the ruin, this is the fate of Henry, the fourth Roman Emperor, as he is called by his followers, but by Catholics, that is, by all those preserving faith and obedience to blessed Peter and to his successors, he is the chief pirate and heresiarch, and also apostate, and he was properly said to be a persecutor of souls rather than of bodies.* These are his words. While he there teaches that Henry became a tyrant in his youth, he demonstrates that the judgment of Gregory against that same king was just.

Finally after that, when he had cited the words of the public assembly against Gregory, and then the defense of St. Anselm on behalf of Gregory, the Abbot adds this: *Bishop Anselm wrote these things which are quite contrary to his previous opinion; he was a very learned man, a man of great talent, outstanding in eloquence and, which is most important, he was famous for his fear of God and his holy way of life, so much so that both in life and after his death he was well known for his miracles.* These are his words. Certainly since he places the praise of Gregory before his accusers, it is surprising if he does not also seem tacitly to be praising Gregory.

Finally, after that, he has this to say about the successor of Gregoiy VII: *Desiderius, the Roman cardinal and abbot, a true servant of Christ, although suffering much in his heart and body, took his place. But since he was suffering from a grave infirmity when he was raised to this high position, he obtained by his prayers that within a few days he might be taken from this life.* But who can doubt that this Desiderius, if he was a true servant of Christ, would ever have approved the cause of Gregory, unless he knew he was a just man?

Naucterus in his Chronicle 37 said: *Gregory was a religious man, fearing God, a lover of justice and equality, constant in adversity, who for the sake of God never feared to do what pertains to justice.*

Marianus Scotus, a monk at Fulda, who lived during the time of Gregory VII, said in Chronicle for the year 1075: *Gregory having heard the just complaints of Catholics against Henry, and the frightfulness of his crimes, moved by zeal for God, declared the King to be excommunicated, especially because of simony; this fact very much pleased the Catholics, but it very much displeased the those guilty of simony and the supporters of the King.*

Abbot Dodechinus continued the work of Marianus and in the year 1083 he said: *Urban II confirmed the writings and decrees of the venerable Pope Gregory proclaimed against the schismatics.* And in the year 1090 he named him Pope Gregoiy of blessed memory.

Lambert of Schaffnaburg, who live at the same time, in his history of German affairs said: *The constancy of Hildebrand, and his invincible determination against*

avarice, excluded all claims of human trickery. Likewise: *The signs and prodigies, which frequently took place through the prayers of Pope Gregory, and his fervent zeal for God and the laws of the Church, strengthened him sufficiently against the poisonous tongues of his detractors.* Likewise in the same place he recounts the death of bishop Gulielmus, who together with Benno had opposed Gregory. *Suddenly,* he said, *seized by a serious illness, he cried out with a mournful lamentation in the presence of all that by a just judgment of God he lost both his present and eternal life, because he had given his complete support to the King for all of his evil intentions, and hoping to gain his favor, while knowing the Pope was innocent, he had inflicted grave insults on the holy Roman Pontiff, a man of apostolic virtue.* Finally, in the same place he said: *The Pope, when he celebrated the Mass, holding the body of the Lord in his hand faced the King and said clearly: For a long time I have been accused by you and by your supporters of occupying the apostolic See through the heresy of simony, and of staining my life by other crimes. Therefore with the gain of satisfaction, I will remove the suspicion of scandal from everyone, and I beseech God that today by his judgment he either absolve me from suspicion of the reported crimes, if I am innocent, or that he kill me immediately, if I am guilty; and immediately he took the body of the Lord and ate it, and after he had freely taken it, when the people had congratulated the Pope for his innocence, for a time they shouted in praise of God. Then he turned to the king: My son, he said, if you please, now you do what you saw me do. The King, after the requested delay, refused to cleanse himself in this way, and he suffered no injury. For when he had returned to his own people, immediately also he returned to his usual way of acting, and he did not rest until he had driven blessed Gregory from the city, and had replaced him with Gilbert, the bishop of Ravenna.* These are his words.

Of the Germans John Aventinus remains, who wrote in our own century, and although he writes many things about our Gregory based on a certain author without a name and therefore also without authority, nevertheless in some places also, having been overcome by the truth, he reprimands Henry and praises Gregory. For he says this in book 5, page 563 of his Annals: *Not even his friends deny that Henry was famous for the bad reports about his debaucheries, lovers, lewdness and adultery.* And after that: *Paul Bernietensis, who covered his life in two books, and other vigorous defenders of his actions, say that Gregory was a very holy and strong man.* And after that on page 579 he described the crimes attributed to Gregory by his adversaries; then he added this: *Opposed to these charges, Anselm the bishop of Lucca (who interpreted the hymns about Gregory, and the other things that were written about the sufferings of our Defender) and Gulielmus Hirsunus wrote many things and declared that he was a just man and that this was proved by miracles after his death.*

Therefore, we have the innocence of Gregory proved in three ways—by the testimony of written documents, by the testimony of a dying adversary, by the testimony of God invoked by the Pontiff. There is one remaining calumny of Sigebert, who writes in his Chronicle that Gregory VIII observed that, if a priest were living in concubinage and wanted to celebrate Mass, he could not validly consecrate the species, and therefore he forbade Christians to be present at Masses celebrated by priests living in concubinage.

I respond that Sigebert was a follower of Henry IV, as Trithemius reports in the Catalogue of writings, and therefore he interpreted the interdict of Gregory unfavorably. Bishop Anselm, who was older and holier than Sigebert, reports what Gregoiy commanded in a better and more faithful way. In letter 8 to Abbot Gulielmus he says the following: *Concerning priests, who openly show themselves as sinners and by their lust enemies of God, it is to be held absolutely what was established by apostolic providence and just ecclesiastical law, namely, it is in no way suitable that one should stand reverently there, where smelling with obstinately open and shameless lust, while despising the prohibition of God and the saints, they serve at the holy altar; indeed they are not really serving, but in what pertains to themselves they are scandalously polluting it. The things they are doing are not to be contemned, but he thinks rather that those doing them are to be execrated, so that those who do not show reverence for the presence of God and the angels, having been scorned by the detestation of men, might desist from contaminating holy things.* These are his words. He explained veiy well the decree of Gregory published during his time.

Now is the right time to present the catalogue of the authors who wrote favorably about Gregoiy VII. First of all, therefore, during the time of Gregory himself Leo Hostiensis around the year 1080 in book 3 of his history wrote many things about the holiness of Gregory, in which are included also heavenly revelations and visions of the holy servants of God. At the same time Marianus Scotus wrote about Gregoiy, as a holy Pontiff, in book 3 of his Chronicle from the year 1075 until 1083. Likewise, Lambert Schaffhaburg not far from the end of his history of the German people. St. Anselm of Canterbuiy in letter 8 and at the beginning of his book on Easter. St. Anselm of Lucca in his letter to Guibertus. Stephen of Halberstadt in a letter to Walram in Duodechimus in the Additions to Marianus Scotus. Bernard Corbejensis in his Apology for Gregory according to Trithemius in his catalogue of Authors. Guitmundus in books 1 and 3 on the sacrament of the Eucharist. Finally, Paul Bemietensis and Gerochus Reicherspergensis, whom John Aventinus in book 5 of his Annals says wrote favorably about Gregory and because of that suffered exile. Therefore, these ten holy and learned authors defended Gregoiy during his lifetime, but there is only one of the authors of that age who accuses him, Benno the pseudo-cardinal.

Then around the year 1100 Sigebert in his Chronicle, although he favored the Emperor Henry, as we said above, nevertheless did not dare to attributed any crime to Gregory, of those that Benno and the Centuriatorians mention; he attributed to him only an inconsiderate zeal, and an error concerning the ministers of the sacrament, and Anselm fully defended him on this point. Then Sigebert in the same place says that Anselm of Lucca wrote in favor of Gregory, and that the sanctity of this Anselm was proved by signs and miracles from God, and this certainly pertains to the great praise of Gregory. Not long thereafter Gratian, about the year 1150, mentioned Gregory's decree 15, question 6, canon "Nos sanctorum." And Otto Frisingensis, renowned for his learning and probity of life, in book *6* of his history wrote admirably in favor of Gregory. Likewise Gulielmus Tyrius about the year 1180 in book 1, chapter 13 on the holy war, and Godfrey of Viterbo in chapter 17 of his universal Chronicle. Abbot Conrad about the year 1200

in his Chronicle, although he neither openly praises nor blames Gregory, still (as we have said) indirectly in many ways he praises him, but in no way does he reprimand him. At that same time Dodechinus in the Additions to Marianus openly praises Gregory and censures Henry. Vincent about the year 1250, in book 25, chapter 44 of his special history, testifies that Gregory VII was illustrious for his miracles and the gift of prophecy. St. Thomas in II-II, q. 12, a. 2 cites Gregory in a favorable way. Martin Polonus around the year 1300 in his life of the same Gregory. And John Villanus in book 4, chapter 21 in his history of Florence; Blondus about the year 1400, dec. 2, book 3; Matthew Palmerius in his Chronicle, and Thomas Waldensis in tome 2, chapter 43; St. Antoninus around the year 1450, 2nd part, Summary of History, title 16, chapter 1 § 21; Platina in the life of Gregory, and Aeneas Sylvius in Comp. Biondi; John Trithemius around the year 1500 in his Chronicle; John Naucterus in his Chronicle, gener. 37; Albert Krantius in book 5 of Metrop. and Sabellicus Enneade 9, book 3, and Volterranus in book 22 of his Anthropology described the deeds of Gregory as plainly those of a very holy man. These are thirty-two authors, which we cite in order to refute the impudence of the one Benno, the Centuriatorians and Tilmann. And also to demonstrate fully the lie of Tilmann, who dared to write that the crimes of Gregory VII were made known by the monks and acquaintances of the Pope, since we have shown the opposite, namely, that Gregory was praised by all.

CHAPTER XIV

ON THE OTHER PONTIFFS, TO WHOM AN ERROR IN FAITH IS FALSELY ATTRIBUTED

The thirty-second is Alexander III, who in the chapter "Cum esses" on contracts, says that it is foreign to the divine law and the custom of the Church that, in making a contract, more than three witnesses are required, and in the same place under pain of excommunication that no one should rescind a contract made with three witnesses. But the contrary is found in the praxis of the whole Christian world. For contracts are not considered to be valid, unless seven witnesses are used. The same Alexander, in the chapter "LiceE" on the espousal of a man and a woman, says that some of his predecessors have judged that a matrimony contracted through words when the parties are present, but has not been consummated, can be annulled by a second marriage, but that he holds the contrary view. From this it follows that either Alexander or his predecessors erred.

I respond to the first argument with a gloss of the canonists: that Alexander is not handing on this law, except to the men subject to himself in temporal and spiritual matters; and therefore that canon does not affect civil laws nor the praxis of the rest of the Christian world. Or if he means it to apply to all Christians, that it is to be understood to apply only to pious matters, about which the Church judges, that is, that the Pontiff wills that contracts, not indeed all of them, but only those which make the Church or some holy place the heir, are valid, even if only three witnesses have been used. To the second point I say that neither Alexander nor his predecessors have defined anything, but they are explaining only what they think.

The thirty-third is Celestine III, whom Alphonse de Castro in book 1, chapter 4 on heresies says cannot in any way be excused of heresy, because he taught that through heresy a marriage can be so dissolved that it is permissible for someone to enter into another marriage whose former spouse has fallen into heresy. For although now this decree of Celestine does not exist, still formerly it was in the ancient decretals in the chapter "Laudabilem," on the conversion of infidels, and Alphonse says that he saw that decree. Now it is evident that this opinion of Celestine is heretical, both because Innocent III taught the contrary in the chapter "Quanto" on divorce, and also because the same thing is defined in the Council of Trent in session 24, canon 5.

I respond that neither Celestine nor Innocent decreed anything certain about that matter, but both responded what seemed to them to be probable. This is manifestly deduced from the words of Innocent who, when he says that his predecessor thought differently, indicates that the whole matter is still in a state of opinion. But what Alphonse says, namely, that the letter of Celestine at one time was among the decretals, surely is true, but one cannot deduce from that that a decree fully apostolic and *ex cathedra* had been proclaimed by Celestine, since it is certain that there are many other things in decretal letters, which do not make something to be of faith, but only declare to us the opinions of the Pontiffs on that particular matter.

The thirty-fourth is Innocent III, who in the chapter "Per venerabilem" teaches that the old law was not fully abrogated: *Surely,* he said, *since Deuteronomy is said to be the*

second law, from the meaning of the word it is proved that what is decreed there must be observed also in the New Testament.

But this decree of Innocent conflicts with the decree of St. Peter in Acts 15. I respond that Innocent in that place did not want to say that Deuteronomy now must be observed literally, but inasmuch as the things said in it are figures of the New Testament. Therefore Innocent thought that Deuteronomy was called the second law, because it contains many things that pertain figuratively to the new law.

The thirty-fifth is Nicholas IV, who in the chapter "Exiit" defined that Christ by word and example taught perfect poverty, which consists in abandoning all things, with nothing left under one's control, neither in particular or in common, and therefore that such poverty is holy and meritorious. But John XXII teaches that this is false and heretical in his Extracts. For, in the Extract "Ad conditorem canonum" he teaches that such poverty is impossible, by which someone in things consumed in their use renounces for himself all dominion, and retains only the use of them, and in the Extract "Cum inter nonnullos" he declares that it is heretical to say that Christ taught such poverty by his word and example. And in the Extract "Quia quorundam" he teaches the same thing and recommends it at great length. John a Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 112 of his Summa tries in every way to reconcile these Pontiffs, just as John XXII himself tries to show that he is not disagreeing with Nicholas.

But actually, unless I am greatly mistaken, they cannot be reconciled completely. Therefore, it should be noted that three questions are being treated by John and Nicholas. The first is, whether in things consumed in their use, the use can be separated from the dominion. Second, whether poverty, which removes all dominion from oneself, while only the use remains, is holy and meritorious. Third, whether Christ by word and example taught such poverty.

On the first question John responds that in such things the use cannot be separated from dominion: to domineer means to be able to destroy; therefore it is impossible to be able to destroy something by using it, like eating bread, and not to be the lord of that thing. But Nicholas teaches that such a thing can be done, and rightly so, for Clement V clearly teaches the same thing in his "Exivi de paradiso," because to be lord does not mean to be able to destroy something in just any way, but to be able to destroy it when, where, and as someone wishes, and also to donate, sell or change it, etc. But it is certain that all true religious have the use of the bread they eat, and the wine they drink, but that they cannot donate, sell, change, or throw those things away. You will say: Therefore John erred. I respond: It seems that he did, but not in a matter of faith. For this question does not pertain to faith, as John himself says in the Extract "Quia quorundam": in fact, concerning this matter there are still different opinions of the doctors.

On the second question Nicholas thinks that that poverty is holy and meritorious; John denies it. And although Nicholas seems to think better about this, still Nicholas did not define it as an article of faith, nor did John directly attack it. For, John in that Extract "Ad conditorem canonum" only intended to renounce dominion of those things that are given to the Franciscans, which Nicholas said belong to the Roman Pontiff; but John could renounce such a right.

On the third question (which is the most important of all, and pertains to faith) Nicholas and John do not disagree. For Nicholas says that Christ sometimes taught perfect poverty by word and example; but sometimes he demonstrated a less rigid poverty by example, as the common father and teacher of all. But John defines that it is heretical to say that Christ here on earth never had anything belonging to himself, either in particular or in common. These two views do not conflict, because Nicholas does not deny that Christ sometimes had something proper to himself at least in common; but he denies that Christ always led such a life. John also does not deny that Christ sometimes had nothing belonging to himself, either in particular or in common; but he denies that Christ always led such a life.

But there is proof that Christ taught both positions by word and example. For, he taught absolute poverty in Matt. 10:9-10 when he said: *Take no gold, nor silver, nor copper in your belts, no bag for your journey, nor two tunics, nor sandals, nor staff.* And it does not matter whether these words signify a precept or a counsel, and whether they can be explained differently than about the abdication of all dominion. For, it suffices in order to save the opinion of Nicholas that this is the teaching of Christ. For although Christ adds: *The laborer deserves his food,* he obligated the peoples to support the preachers, and therefore conceded to preachers that they might justly require support from the people, still he did not obligate preachers themselves that they require this as something owed to them, as is clear from Paul in 1 Cor. 9:4ff, but he permitted them to live from their labors or to receive as a gift without any usurpation of dominion, what in justice was due to them. In addition there is the fact that St. Francis accepted those words in this sense, and both God by many miracles and the universal Church by common consent approved his rule of life.

But that the Lord showed by his example this same thing is clear from what he says in Matt. 8:20: *The Son of man has nowhere to lay his head.* And from these words in Luke 8:3: *Women followed him who provided for him out of their means.* For then the Lord with the apostles lived without a home only from the alms of the faithful.

But that the Lord also taught another form of life by his example is clear from John 13:29, where we read that he had a small place in which he lived together with the disciples. There is no doubt that they had dominion over that money, at least in common, because from it they were accustomed also to give alms, as is clear from that same place. Afterwards the faithful, who were in Jerusalem with the apostles, imitated this way of life, as is clear from Acts 4, and almost all the religious orders did the same. For, with the exception of the Franciscans, all have, at least in common, dominion over movable things.

The thirty-sixth is Pope John XXII, who is blamed by many, and especially by William Occam in his Work of 93 days, and by Adrian in the question concerning Confirmation, for teaching that the souls of the saved will not see God before the resurrection. Erasmus in the preface of book 5 of Irenaeus says the same thing with an addition. For he said the following: *It seems that the Roman Pontiff John XXII fell into this error, and was forced by the work of the Parisian theologians to recant in the presence of King Philip of the French, not without a trumpet. John Gerson mentions this in his sermon for Easter.*

Calvin adds in his Institutes, book 4, chapter 7 § 28, that the same John taught that souls are mortal. *But,* he said, *if they want the privilege which they claim to be valid, it is necessary that they remove from the number of the Pontiffs John XXII, who said openly that souls are mortal, and die together with the bodies until the day of the resurrection. And so that you may see that the whole Roman See with its main supporters at the time collapsed totally, none of the cardinals opposed this madness. But the school of Paris urged the king of France to force him to recant. The king forbade his people to be in communion with him, unless he immediately recovered his senses; and he made this public in the usual way. Having been forced by this necessity, he abjured his error.* These are his words. But he does not prove it except by writing in the margin: *John Gerson, who was living at that time, testified to this.*

I respond first of all to Adrian that this John really thought that souls will not see God until after the resurrection; also that he thought this, when he could still think that way without the danger of heresy, because at the time no definition of the Church had been made on this matter. John wanted to define the question, but while he was still involved in study and consultation he died, as Benedict XII, John's successor, says in the Constitution which begins, *"Benedictus Deus* all of this is recorded by Alphonse a Castro in book 3 against heresies under the word "Beatitude."

But John Villanus in book 11, chapter 19 of his history records that Pope John, on the day before his death, partly declared and also partly revoked his opinion. First of all he attested that, when he had spoken about this matter, he never intended to define the question, but was only examining it in order to find the truth. Then he added that he now thinks the opinion more probable which says that the blessed enjoy the divine vision even before the Day of Judgment. And he said that he embraced this opinion, unless at some time the Church defines otherwise, and that he willingly subjected all of his opinions to that definition. This retraction clearly teaches that the mind of Pope John was always good and Catholic.

To Calvin I say that he shamelessly uttered five lies in very few words.

First, that John Gerson lived during the time of John XXII; for it is certain from John Villanus in book 11, chapter 19, and from all the other histories, that John XXII died in the year of our Lord 1334, but it is also certain from Trithemius on illustrious men that Gerson was bom in the year 1363; therefore, Gerson had not yet been bom when Pope John died.

The second lie is that Gerson says that Pope John denied the immortality of the soul. For, Gerson says nothing about the errors of this John, except in a sermon on Easter in Volume 4, which is the only place cited by all against the error of John. But in that place Gerson says this: *He did this,* he said,ybr *the thief, who probably had not yet completed the penance for all of his sins, who at that particular hour was beatified, and saw God face to face like the saints in paradise. Because of this also the falsity of the teaching of Pope John XXII is apparent.* This is what he says there. He does not explain further the nature of his teaching, but when he says that the falsity of the teaching of Pope John is apparent from the fact that the thief crucified with Christ saw God immediately after his death, he indicates clearly that John erred in this because he believed that the souls of the

saints do not see God immediately after death. But that Pope John denied the immortality of the soul, neither Gerson, nor anyone else wrote before Calvin, and not even William Occam, who was very hostile to Pope John.

But I see why Calvin invented such a horrendous lie; it is because that error of Pope John about the vision of God, for Calvin is not an error, but veiy true doctrine. For, in book 3, chapter 20 of his Institutes he says that only Christ is in heaven, and that the saints are waiting in some kind of fore-court until the end of the world. And in § 24 he says that the dead saints are still joined together with us in faith; but if they have faith, then they do not see God. Therefore, since Calvin sees that what others blamed in Pope John, cannot be blamed by him, and still he did not want to miss any opportunity of accusing the Pontiff, he had recourse to his own teacher, the father of lies, and so he borrowed from him that outstanding calumny.

The third lie is that no cardinal opposed John's opinion. For, that this is false is clear both because neither Gerson nor anyone else says this, and because several thought differently, as was clear from the definition, which was made by Benedict XII after the death of John, based on the consensus of all the cardinals, as is evident from the letter of Benedict. And there was no reason why those, who disagreed with John, would fear to contradict John during his lifetime, since Benedict XII in his Constitution says that Pope John strongly urged the cardinals and all the other doctors that they should sincerely saj what they thought so that the truth could be found. Finally, John Villanus, who lived q that time, in book 10, last chapter of his history writes that most of the cardinals opposée Pope John's opinion while he was still alive.

The fourth lie is that the King of France forbade his people to be in communion with John. Gerson in the place cited says that King Philip of France put more faith in the Parisian doctors than he did in Pope John, as a particular doctor examining this question. But no one reports that because of this the King excommunicated the Pontiff, nor is it credible that a Christian King dared to do such a thing.

The fifth lie is that the Pontiff abjured his error. For, neither Gerson writes that, nor anyone else, nor did the Pope have to abjure an error, since he had not fallen into any error; he did indeed retract his opinion on the day before his death, but at the urging of his advisers, not at the command of the King. See John Villanus in book 11, chapter 9; from there also the calumnies of Erasmus can be detected. For, it is not true that John was forced to retract, and much less true is it that it was done in the presence of King Philip.

The thirty-seventh is John XXIII, who at the Council of Constance in session 11 was accused of a pernicious heresy, for he is said to have denied the future life and the resurrection of the body. I respond that John XXIII was not a completely certain and indubitable Pontiff; therefore, it is not necessary to defend him, for at the time there were three who were said to be Popes: Gregory XII, Benedict XIII, and John XXIII, and it was not easy to judge which one of them was the true and legitimate Pope, since there were learned supporters for each one of them. Moreover, I will add that it is very probable and almost certain that that error was falsely attributed to Pope John XXIII. For, first of all, in that session of the Council articles were formulated which were opposed to Pope John; first, 53 articles are proposed, all of which pertain to morals, and all of them

are confirmed by their certain witnesses. Then some others are proposed, without their certain supporters, and of these the penultimate one is what we are dealing with here.

Therefore, that article was not approved, except by a rumor of the people who, since they saw that John led a dissolute life, began to think and also to say that he did not believe in the future life and the resurrection of the body.

But who cannot see that one cannot rightly deduce a heresy from evil actions? For, how many people can be named who believe correctly, but live badly? Then in session 12 a definitive sentence of the Council is declared against Pope John, and the reasons for his condemnation and deposition are recounted briefly; but there was no mention of error or heresy. This certainly is an evident argument that it could not be proved that Pope John was accused of heresy; for if that could be proved, it would have to be mentioned in the first place among the reasons for his condemnation, since no reason is more just for judging a Pontiff than the taint of heresy; indeed there is no other reason because of which he can be rightly judged.

The thirty-eighth is Benedict XIII, whom the Council of Constance in session 37 condemned because of heresy. But that Benedict was not a legitimate Pontiff, since he succeeded Clement VII, who had invaded the Chair while Urban VI, the true Pope, was still living; also he was not truly a heretic. The only objection made to him was that he did not believe a council has more power than the Sovereign Pontiff has; in this matter Benedict did not err in any way, but there will be more about this elsewhere.

The thirty-ninth is Eugene IV, whose pontificate was annulled by the council of Basel, because he had fallen into heresy. But he also had not departed from the truth in any way. Therefore the same council, when it had been continued in Ferrara, cancelled its prior decisions and recognized Nicholas V, the successor of Eugene, as the true Pontiff, as can be known from the letters of the same Nicholas, which are usually attached to the council of Basel in the tomes of the councils.

The fortieth is Innocent VIII, who seems to have sinned because he permitted the Norwegians to celebrate the sacrifice of the Mass without wine, as Raphael Volateranus says in book 7 of his Geography. But this can be answered easily. For, first of all, he did not publish a decree in which he declared to the whole Church that it is permitted to offer the sacrifice without wine. Therefore, if he erred, he erred in fact, but not in doctrine. Then, he does not permit that, in the place of wine, some other liquid can be consecrated, which would have been to pervert the matter of the sacrament, but he permitted only that they might consecrate the Eucharist with some other species only, and that because of extreme necessity, because in that region wine could not be preserved without immediately turning sour. This of course either is no error, or certainly it is not a confirmed error. In addition, it seems very astonishing, if at that time they did not have the use of wine, or that they could not preserve it, since at this time it is so frequent that without it they do not want even to communicate; therefore with good reason we can suspect that Volateranus was deceived in this matter.

CHAPTER XV

A QUESTION IS PROPOSED: DOES THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF HAVE TRULY COACTIVE JURISDICTION, SO THAT HE CAN MAKE LAWS, WHICH OBLIGE IN CONSCIENCE, AND JUDGE AND PUNISH TRANSGRESSORS?

Up to this point we have demonstrated that the Sovereign Pontiff is the judge of controversies, which arise in the Church, and that his judgment is certain and infallible. A third question now follows: Namely, whether the Sovereign Pontiff can force the faithful to believe or to do what he has judged. The same principle, while observing due proportion, applies also to the other bishops in their dioceses. But before we come to the reasons, either ours or those of the adversaries, it will be worth the effort to make few comments on the state of the question, and the opinion of the adversaries.

First of all it should be noted that we are not speaking about the Pontiff as a temporal ruler of a certain province; for in this way it is certain that he can make laws for his subjects and also enforce them with the sword. The heretics do not deny this, given that the Pontiff is a temporal ruler, although they do deny that it is fitting for him to exercise such authority, but we will treat this matter in the following book. Therefore, now we are dealing with the Pontiff only as he is the Pontiff of the whole Church, and we ask whether or not he has true power over all the faithful in spiritual matters, as kings have in temporal, so that just as they can make civil laws and punish transgressors with temporal punishments, so the Pontiff can make ecclesiastical laws that are truly binding in conscience, and can punish transgressors at least with spiritual punishments, such as excommunication, suspension, interdict, etc. For, the temporal or civil power, which pertains to the Pontiff either directly or indirectly, will be considered in the following book. Now we will begin to discuss only the spiritual or ecclesiastical power, the purpose of which is eternal life.

It should be noted secondly that we are inquiring only about just laws; for, unjust laws are not in the proper sense laws, as Augustine teaches in book 1, chapter 5 of his treatise on free will. But for a law to be just four conditions are required.

First, on the part of the end, that it is ordered to the common good; for, just as a king differs from a tyrant, according to Aristotle in book 8, chapter 10 of his Ethics, because the former seeks the common good, while the latter seeks his own private good, so also a just law differs from a tyrannical law. Second, on the part of the agent, it must be made by the one having authority; for no one can impose a law on someone not subject to him. Third, on the part of the matter, so that a virtue is not forbidden, nor a vice commanded. Fourth, on the part of the form, so that the law is established and promulgated in the proper manner and order, that is, the law observes that proportion in distributing honors and imposing burdens, which the subjects have in reference to the republic.

For, if the Pontiff were to order that in Lent all should fast in the same way—children and mature adults, the strong and weak, the healthy and the sick, it would be an unjust law. Likewise, if he should decree that only the rich and nobles can be named bishops, but not the poor and the common men, although otherwise they are more learned and

better men, that would be absolutely unjust, although elsewhere at some time, because of special circumstances, it could be just. But although an unjust law is not a law, and of itself does not bind in conscience, nevertheless a distinction must be made between laws. For, unjust laws by reason of the matter, that is, those contrary to the divine law, either natural or positive, not only do not oblige, but also they must not in any way be observed, according to what is said in Acts 5:29: *We must obey God rather than men.* That is also taught by Jerome in his comments on Eph. 6, Augustine on Ps. 125 and sermon 6 on the word of the Lord, and Bernard in his book on precepts and dispensations. But those that are unjust on the part of the end, or of the author, or also of the form should be observed, when scandal would be given if they are not observed. This can be deduced from the saying in Matt. 5:40-41 : *If anyone would sue you and take your coat, let him have your cloak as well; and if anyone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles.* For the meaning is not that we should always do this, but that we should be ready to do it, whenever it will be necessaiy for the glory of God. Likewise from the verse in 1 Pet. 2:18: *Servants, be submissive to your masters with all respect, not only to the kind and gentle but also to the overbearing.*

Finally, it should be noted that the idea is pleasing to many heretics which teaches that there is no authority in the Church to make laws that bind in conscience. Formerly those who thought this way were the Waldenses, according to Antoninus in par. 4, tit. 11, chapter 7 § 2 of his Summa of Theology. Later, Marsilius of Padua taught the same thing in his book under the title of "Defender of the Peace," against which Pighius wrote in book 5 on the Church Hierarchy. After that John Wycliffe taught the same thing, as is clear from article 38 which was condemned in session 8 of the Council of Constance. Hence they deduce that the pontifical decretals are apocryphal and that those men are stupid who pay any attention to them. Later John Huss said the same thing, as is clear from article 15. Later John of Westphalia taught the same thing; for there still exists a record of the condemnation of the articles of this John, made at Mainz in the year 1479; the first one was that the prelates of the Church cannot establish a law binding in conscience, but only laws exhorting the people to keep the commandments of God.

Finally, in our time all Lutherans and Calvinists teach the same thing. And first of all Luther in his book on the Babylonian Captivity, in the chapter on Baptism said: *By what right does the Pope establish laws for us? Who gave him the power of capturing our freedom given to us by our Baptism, since neither the Pope, nor a bishop, nor any other man has the right of establishing one syllable over a Christian man, unless it is done with his consent?* He teaches similar things in his book on Christian Freedom, which Jodocus Clictoveus in book one of his work called "Anti-Luther," and he teaches it in Assertion 27, which John Roffensis attacks. But he expressed this idea vehemently in his explanation of the vision of Daniel. And, in order to condemn ecclesiastical laws with deeds, in 1520 he burned publicly the whole body of canon law, as John Cochlaeus writes in his life of Luther.

Philip Melanchthon teaches the same thing in the Augsburg Confessions, article 28, and in his Apology for the same; and Calvin in book 4, chapters 10-12; their opinion is almost the same, and it can be reduced to four points. For, first of all, they teach that

bishops, and therefore also the Pope, can establish a certain order in the Church in order to preserve a useful discipline, like defining on what day one should go to Church, how and by whom the Psalms are to be sung, or how the Scriptures are to be read in Church, etc., but always in such a way that these rules do not bind in conscience, unless to prevent scandal, so that one is free to observe it or not to observe it, provided there is no scandal for others. But they teach that the Pope and the bishops cannot establish any true law, which is not expressly stated in Scripture.

Secondly, they teach not only that the Pope or the bishops cannot establish a new law, but they also cannot force Christians to keep the law of God, by commanding with authority that it is to be observed, and if they do not do that, to proceed with a formal judgment against transgressors; so all they can do is to exhort, admonish, reprehend.

Thirdly, they teach that there is indeed in the Church the power of excommunicating, that is, of rejecting incorrigible persons from the community, but they do not grant that this power is in the Pope or in a bishop per se, but only in the Church, that is, in the assembly of the ministers, and that with the consent of the people. This is not surprising; for they do not want the Pope to be over a bishop, nor a bishop over a priest with regard to authority. And they attribute nothing to priests, except the ability to preach and administer the sacraments to those persons whom the secular magistrate assigns to them.

But in the Catholic Church it has always been believed that bishops in their dioceses, and the Roman Pontiff for the whole Church, are true ecclesiastical officials, who can by their own authority, and also without the consent of the people or the advice of the priests, establish laws that bind in conscience judge ecclesiastical causes like other judges, and finally punish transgressors. These three functions will now be proved briefly.

CHAPTER XVI

IT IS PROVED BY THE TESTIMONY OF THE WORD OF GOD THAT THE PONTIFFS CAN ESTABLISH TRUE LAWS

Therefore, the Catholic position is proved by many kinds of arguments, and first of all from Holy Scripture.

The first place is Deut. 17:12: *The man who acts presumptuously, by not obeying the command of the priest who stands to minister there before the Lord your God, or the judge, that man shall die; so you shall purge the evil from Israel.* That place should also be understood to be about Christian Pontiffs. For, as the Jewish people then were the people of God, so now the Christian people. And we cannot say that the ecclesiastical leader in the new law has less authority than leaders had in the old law, since on the contrary here we see that everything is greater and holier. But the precepts of the Jewish high priests were true commands, not admonitions and exhortations, as is clear from the words "the command of the priest," and they obliged in conscience. For otherwise transgressors would not have been punished so severely. For if those did not sin who disobeyed the precepts of the high priest, then they seem to have been killed without their own fault.

They respond concerning this and similar texts that it can only be deduced that those sin in conscience, who despise their superior and who out of pride refuse to obey. But from this it does not follow that those sin in conscience who, without contempt or scandal, do not observe such laws about indifferent things.

But first of all we know that at least in the Pontiff there is a true authority of commanding, such as is present in a political official, which the Waldenses, Marsilius of Padua and others deny. Then from this we conclude evidently that the laws of Pontiffs oblige in conscience, even without contempt or scandal. For, whoever can command, can also by his command make an indifferent act necessary, and per se good; but to omit an act necessary and per so good is a sin in conscience, even without contempt and scandal.

The proposition is proved. For if an indifferent act is commanded, then it will be necessary, otherwise it would be commanded in vain; and this can be proved a posteriori. For, it would follow that the positive laws of God do not oblige in conscience. Therefore, why did circumcision oblige the Jews, and baptism oblige us, since they are acts in themselves indifferent? Is it not because the presence of a precept of God makes them to be necessary acts of religion? Likewise, why were the Jews obliged in conscience not to eat pork, so that the Maccabees preferred to die rather than to eat pork, since pork meat is something indifferent? Is it not because the precept of God made that abstinence to be a necessary act of temperance? But God did not do this inasmuch as he is God, but only because he is the legislator. Therefore every true legislator, and anyone who can command, especially in the name of God, can do the same. But the Pontiff can command, as we have already shown, and as we will show again below. Therefore he can make something indifferent to be necessary, and therefore oblige in conscience, even without contempt and scandal.

The second place is Matt. 16:19: *Whatever you bind on earth shall be bound in heaven.* These words can and ought to be referred to all things, which according to the use of Scripture, are said to be bound. For, the Lord speaks in general terms, and he does not say, *whomever your bind,* but *whatever your bind.* But we find in Matt. 23:4 that "to bind" means to impose a law: *They bind heavy burdens, hard to bear, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger.*

Therefore the Lord promised Peter that whatever he bound, that is, by prescribing an obligation he should impose on the faithful, it is bound also in heaven, that is, he will hold it as valid and binding; therefore a precept of Peter is a precept of Christ; therefore anyone who does not obey it sins. And this is confirmed by the testimony of Jerome on the words in Matt. 18:18 "whatever you bind": *He gave power to the apostles,* he said, *so that they might understand that to them is given the power to strengthen the human decision with the divine decision.*

The third place is John 21:17: *Feed my sheep.* There when Christ is about to give to Peter what he had promised him in Matt. 16:18, he uses a kingly expression, namely, ποίμαινε τα πρόβατα μου; on this see above in book 1, chapter 15.

The fourth place is John 20:21: *As the Father has sent me, even so I send you.* On this text Chrysostom said: *He left his ministry to them.* And Theophylact said: *Take on yourselves my work.* Therefore, the Lord left his place to his apostles, and he willed that they should function in his kingdom by governing with his authority. This is also confirmed by the saying in Luke 10:16: *He who hears you hears me, and he who rejects you rejects me.*

Cyprian in book 4, letter 9 and Basil in chapter 23 in the Constitution of Monasteries teach that these words pertain properly to the apostles and their successors. But Christ was sent by the Father with power, not only of preaching and administering the sacraments, but also of commanding and judging, as everyone admits; therefore, he gave the same power to the apostles, and especially to Peter. And it cannot be responded that these things were said to all the apostles together as a group, but not to them as single individuals. For, the apostles soon were to be separated from each other, and were to go into different parts of the world. The Lord was not ignorant of that, and so without doubt what he gave to all, he wanted it to be understood that he gave it also to each one separately.

The fifth place is Acts 15:28. Peter with the Fathers of the council writes to the Gentiles converted to the faith: *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay upon you no greater burden than these necessary things: that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols and from blood and from what is strangled and from unchastity.* Here the apostles establish a new law, as Chrysostom pointed out; for, Christ gave no command about blood and what is strangled. And these things by the law of nature are neither good nor bad, but indifferent; but the heretics teach that such things cannot be made necessary by the Church.

But it will be proved now that this was a true law of the apostles binding in conscience, at least for the time in which it was enacted. First, because the apostles call it a burden: *We will lay upon you,* they said, *no greater burden.* Secondly, because they say they are

necessary. Therefore, they were to be observed necessarily, not freely, as the heretics say, according to the constitutions of the Church. Thirdly, because Luke absolutely calls them precepts in Acts 16:4: *As they went on their way through the cities, they delivered to them for observance the decisions which had been reached by the apostles and elders who were at Jerusalem.* Fourthly, by the testimony of Chrysostom in homily 3 on Acts: *See,* he said, *this briefletter has neither an epichireme nor a syllogism, but a command.* For it was the legislation of the Spirit. Finally, because in the canons of the apostles in canon 62 a severe penalties is imposed on those violating this precept, because clerics who eat blood or meat of strangled animals are deposed, and lay people are excommunicated. This law was renewed at the second Council of Orleans in canons 19 and 20. But such a severe penalty cannot be imposed unless it is for a mortal sin.

Calvin responds in book 4, chapter 10 § 21 of his Institutes that the apostles by this law prescribed nothing new, but only that which was always prescribed by divine law, namely, that some should not offend others by scandalizing the weak, by eating food sacrificed to idols, or blood, or what is strangled. And therefore it means that Christians were not obliged in conscience to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, and blood, and what is strangled, but only in order not to scandalize others.

Calvin proves this in three ways. First, the purpose of the apostolic decree was to free the Gentiles from the burden of the Jewish ceremonies. Therefore they overturned their own decree, if they obliged them to the same ceremonies. Secondly, this precept is not now observed, because the danger of scandal has ceased; therefore only scandal was prohibited by this decree. Third, Paul, who was present at this council of the apostles and understood it very well, explains it in the following way in 1 Cor. 8:7; 10-11 and in 10, where he openly teaches that it is not illicit to eat food sacrificed to idols, unless because of that the weak are scandalized: *But some, through being hitherto accustomed to idols, eat food as really offered to an idol; and their conscience, being weak, is defiled.* And after that: *Take care lest this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to the weak. For if anyone sees you, a man of knowledge, at table in an idol's temple, might he not be encouraged, if his conscience is weak, to eat food offered to idols? And so by your knowledge this weak man is destroyed, the brother for whom Christ died.* And in chapter 10:28-29: *If someone says to you, "This has been offered in sacrifice," then out of consideration for the man who informed you, and for conscience" sake—I means his conscience, not yours—do not eat it.* Now it is easily deduced from the Acts of the Apostles that this letter was written after the council of the apostles, for the council is recorded in Acts 15; then in Acts 18 the first entry of Paul into the City of Corinth is narrated. But it is certain that the letter was written after Paul had preached to the same Corinthians. For Paul says in chapter 2:1: *When I came to you, brethren, I did not come proclaiming to you the testimony of God in lofty words, etc.*

But these points can be refuted easily. For although the purpose of the apostolic precept was that the weak might not be scandalized, still the precept itself was not directed to the avoidance of scandal, but to abstaining from food sacrificed to idols, blood, and what was strangled, which was the means to that end. Just as the purpose of all divine precepts is charity, and still the particular precepts of not stealing, not killing,

etc. do not oblige one to charity, but oblige to abstain from some thing and from injuring another. And although the reason for the law, as the lawyers say, is the soul of the law, and therefore when the reason and purpose of the law in general cease to exist, the law should be abrogated, nevertheless when the reason for the law does not cease, except in some particular case, the law still remains in force, and since it is general, it obliges all, even the one in whom the reason for it and the purpose of the law are not found. The law of fasting is a good example of this.

The purpose of fasting is the chastisement of the body against the spirit of concupiscence. Therefore, when this reason ceases completely, which will happen after the resurrection, the law of fasting will also cease. But for now although in one or another person this reason is not operative, still they also are bound to fast, because the law is still in force and is in general.

Now it will be proved that this principle applies in the apostolic law concerning food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled. First, Chrysostom says that this is the new law, and that it is derived from the ceremonial precepts of Moses. But not to scandalize others is an ancient, moral law; therefore the apostles forbade not scandal, but certain kinds of food. Secondly, in the whole decree of the apostles there is no mention of avoiding scandal, but it is absolutely commanded that they abstain from food sacrificed to idols, blood, and what was strangled. Therefore the precept covers those three things; otherwise it will be possible to pervert all laws, even the divine.

Finally, this is the way the Fathers of the early Church understood this precept. For, Tertullian in chapter 9 of his Apologetics said: *Christians do not have the blood of animal at their meals of simple and natural food; they abstain from things strangled and that* if *a natural death, for no other reason than that they may not contract pollution, so muc. as from blood secreted in the viscera. To clench the matter with a single example, you tempt Christians with sausages of blood, just because you are perfectly aware that the thing by which you thus try to get them to transgress they hold unlawful.* There you will notice that Tertullian does not say that Christians abstain from blood because of scandal, but in order not to be contaminated. Indeed they thought blood is unclean, not because of its nature (as the Manicheans thought later), but because of the apostolic prohibition, as also many animals in the old law are said to be unclean, because they are prohibited.

Note also that the pagans, knowing that the eating of blood was illicit for Christians, tried to force them to eat it. From this it is clearly apparent that Christians, not only because of scandal towards Jews who had a horror of eating blood, but as a general rule thought that they were forbidden by the apostles to eat blood. For, there was no possibility of such scandal, when they were tempted by the pagans, because the pagans often ate blood.

Likewise Origen in book 8 against Celsus, while arguing about forbidden foods, says that Christians, because of a command of the apostles, abstain from food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled, and he makes no mention of scandal to the Jews. Cyril also in his Catechism 4 said: *Hold this for certain in your minds, that you are not to eat anything that has been offered to idols, etc.* In this place Cyril is disputing about various foods and he says that meat and wine are indifferent, and that they can be rejected

in a good way or in a bad way: in a good way, if it is done because of the chastisement of the body, or for some other good purpose; in a bad way, if it is done with the idea that meat and wine are unclean. But when he comes to food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled, which were forbidden by the apostles, he makes no distinction, but teaches absolutely that they are not to be eaten, because, given the precept of the apostles, they were simply illicit.

Eusebius in book 5, chapter 1 of his History reports that, when the pagans accused Christians of secretly eating the flesh and blood of infants, the holy martyr Blandina responded: *You err greatly, O men, because you think that those, who will not eat even the blood of brute animals, eat the flesh of infants.* With these words St. Blandina indicated that Christians are not accustomed to eat blood even in secret, where there is no possibility of giving scandal.

St. Augustine near the end of his letter 154 to Publicolus asks this question: Should a hungry traveler, if he finds nothing anywhere except food placed before an idol, when no other person is present, die of hunger rather than eat that food? And he responds: *Either it is certain it was offered to the idol, or it is certain that it was not offered, or it is unknown. Therefore if it is certain, it is better to refuse it out of Christian virtue; but if it is certain it was not offered or if it is not known, without any scruple of conscience it may be taken in a case of necessity.* But certainly in this case raised by St. Augustine, scandal is not involved; nevertheless Augustine judged that it is better to abstain from food offered to idols. Now it seems that no sufficient reason can be given for this case, except the authority of the apostolic precept. There is something similar in what St. Leo writes in letter 79, chapter 5 to Nicetas, where he says that penance must be done by those who knowingly eat food sacrificed to idols, whether they did it out of fear because of threats, or because they were forced by the necessity of hunger.

Finally, the council of Gangrense in chapter 2, which says that those do not have a hope of salvation, who eat food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled, but that those do have a hope of salvation who eat other meats, cannot in any way be explained to be only about those who eat food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled with scandal of others; for also the person who eats any kind of meat and any kind of food that scandalizes others—is guilty of sin. For the Apostle say in 1 Cor. 8:13: *If food is the cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to fall.*

I respond to Calvin's first argument that the obligation of this precept does not conflict with the content and purpose of this decree; for, the apostles decreed that Gentiles should be free from the observance of the Mosaic law, but not from obedience to their own bishops; but this precept about abstaining from food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled was not imposed as being from the law of Moses, but as something apostolic and ecclesiastical. Moreover, the apostles freed Christians from the observance of innumerable ceremonies, but they commanded only one thing, which was easy, and which was to continue for a short space of time.

I respond to the second argument that that precept is not now observed, not because the nature of scandal in any way whatsoever has ceased, but because it has ceased universally; and therefore now (especially in the West) that law has been abrogated.

Some respond to the third argument that when St. Paul wrote that letter the apostolic law had begun to be abrogated, and so Paul warned them that they could indeed eat food offered to idols, but that they should avoid scandal; but this solution is not solid. For in no way is it credible that the law could be abrogated so quickly, especially since at that time the reason still existed because of which the law was made; indeed that law continued to exist for several centuries, as is clear from the authors already cited.

Therefore, I respond in two ways. First, perhaps at the time when Paul wrote that letter to the Corinthians the precept of the apostles about abstaining from food sacrificed to idols, blood and what was strangled had not yet reached the Corinthians. For, the apostles wrote only to the Churches of Syria and Cilicia. For their letter begins like this: *The brethren, both the apostles and the elders, to the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia, greeting.* But Corinth is not in Syria or Cilicia, but in Achaia, which is a province of Europe, while Syria and Cilicia are in Asia. Furthermore, if the Corinthians had the apostolic precept about abstaining from food sacrificed to idols, why, I ask, did they ask Paul by a letter if it was evil to eat food sacrificed to idols? For, that they did put this question to him is evident from 1 Cor. 8. Therefore I say that the Corinthians at that time did not have this precept; for, they had not received it from the council of the apostles, and Paul indicated that it was not necessary yet to give it to them, because he knew that they were veiy superstitious. Therefore, he responds to them what should have been responded according to the natural law, namely, that they are not bound to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, unless by reason of scandal and danger to the weak.

Secondly, I respond: Perhaps the Corinthians had the precept of the council of the apostles, and nevertheless some of them, relying on their own knowledge that the idols are nothing, and therefore that foods offered to idols could not be tainted, boldly ate food offered to idols. This was reported to Paul: he wrote back reprimanding them and giving them the reason for the apostolic precept, which indeed rightly prohibited the use of sacrificed foods, both because of scandal of the weak, and because of the danger of idolatry. Therefore the whole argument of Paul is concerned not with the precept, but with the reason for the precept. And it does not follow that Paul is saying that food sacrificed to idols is not evil of itself, but only by reason of scandal and danger; therefore, if no scandal or danger is present, they can licitly eat it. This, I say does not follow. For although those foods are not evil, except because of those two reasons, still they could be prohibited absolutely. For, many licit things are prohibited, lest they draw us to something illicit, and given that prohibition, they are absolutely illicit.

The sixth place is Rom. 13:Iff.: *Let every person be subject to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those that exist have been instituted by God. Therefore he who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed, and those who resist will incur judgment.* And after that: *Therefore one must be subject, not only to avoid God's wrath but for the sake of conscience.* This passage is to be understood not only of secular rulers, but also of ecclesiastical; this is what Calvin says in book 4, chapter 10 § 5 in his Institutes and it is obvious in itself. For, the Apostle is speaking in general about all powers. For he says: *There is no authority except from God,* which is equivalent to this, *All authority is from God.* But that there is

some ecclesiastical authority, the same Paul teaches in 2 Cor. 13:10 where he says: *I write this while I am away from you, in order that when I come I may not have to be severe in the use of the authority which the Lord has given me.* And although Paul literally is speaking only about secular rulers, still similarly, or even more so, the same thing should be understood about ecclesiastical authorities.

But that the laws of those who are endowed with authority oblige in conscience is clear from these words: *He who resists the authorities resists what God has appointed* (Rom. 13:2). Likewise from these words: *Those who resist will incur judgment.* All understand this to be about both temporal and eternal damnation, such as Chrysostom, Oecumenius, Theophylact, Ambrose, and even the Calvinist Peter the martyr in their comments on this place. Likewise from these words: *Therefore one must be subject,* that is, therefore this is not optional, but necessary. Likewise from this: *Not only to avoid God's wrath but for the sake of conscience,* that is, *understand also that it is necessary for you to obey, not only because of the fear of punishment, but also because of the fear of guilt, which you will incur, by the testimony of your conscience.*

There is no obstacle in the fact that Chrysostom, and Theophylact and Oecumenius follow him in this, understands by "conscience" in this place the awareness of benefits, so that the meaning is: *It is necessary to obey rulers, not only to avoid God's wrath,* that *"^punishment, but also for the sake of conscience,* that is, *because you are aware of how many benefits you receive from the kings.* This, I say, is no obstacle, for the common explanation is about the awareness of sin, as this place is explained by Theodoretus, Ambrose, Bede, Anselm, and others, and also Augustine in letter 54 to Macedonius, and the adversaries, Calvin and the Martyr, approve the same explanation. And the Apostle uses this word *conscience* always in this meaning.

However, Calvin responds to this place in book 4, chapter 10 § 5 in his Institutes that the obligation of conscience, about which the Apostle is speaking, does not refer to the individual laws of the rulers, but to the general precept of God, whereby we are bound to honor princes, and also to the purpose of the laws, that is, peace and the love of neighbor.

But we showed above that it obviously follow from that that we are bound to obey superiors, and that we are also bound in conscience to observe their laws, even without the danger of contempt or scandal. Then when the Apostle says: *Therefore one must be subject, not only to avoid God's wrath but for the sake of conscience,* certainly what is included under "to avoid God's wrath" is also included in the phrase "for the sake of conscience." But the Apostle applies the phrase "to avoid God's wrath" not only to the avoidance of contempt and scandal, but also to the observance of the laws in general. For the ruler not only punishes contempt, but also those in particular who do not keep his laws. For, he kills the thief by hanging, he beheads the murderer, he commands the forger to be burned, even though it is certain that they sinned not out of contempt of the ruler, but from greed for money. Therefore for a similar reason, the expression "for the sake of conscience" should include the violation of the laws. For Paul did not say "be subject out of necessity," only to avoid God's wrath in the observance of particular laws, but also for the sake of conscience in the observance of a general command of not despising the ruler; but he joined those two together simply and without any distinction:

Not only to avoid God's wrath but for the sake of conscience.

Moreover it is so manifest that it is evil to be haughty and to despise one's superior that it was not necessary for Paul to inculcate that idea often and with many words. Therefore not only is he teaching this, but also that about which there could be a doubt among Christians, as Chrysostom and other authors rightly point out, namely, that Christians are also bound in conscience to observe the precepts and laws of their temporal rulers.

The seventh place is 1 Cor. 4:21, where Paul says: *What do you wish? Shall I come to you with a rod, or with love in a spirit of gentleness?* In this text Chrysostom, and other interpreters of this place, and Augustine in book 3, chapter 1 against the letter of Parmenianus by the word "rod" understand the judicial power of punishing sinners. For Christ, as the king of the Church, has the rod, which in Ps. 2:9 is said to be made of iron, because it is inflexible; and in Ps. 45:6 it is called the royal scepter of direction, a Hebrew expression, that is, a *straight rod,* because it punishes justly; and he shares this rod with the bishops, who rule the Church in his name. Hence Augustine in book 2, chapter 30 on *The Harmony of the Gospels,* based on this text reconciles a certain seeming contradiction between Matthew and Mark. Matthew 10:10 says: The apostles should not carry a staff; Mark 6:8 says: They should carry a staff. Augustine reconciles them, because Matthew is speaking about temporal rod, Mark about a spiritual rod, that is, about the apostolic power because of which support from the people was owed to the apostles; for just as taxes are owed to a king because of the royal scepter, so because of a similar scepter tithes are owed to the bishop.

Peter the martyr responds in the Commentary on 1 Cor. 5 that there is indeed in the Church a rod for punishment, however he says it is not in one man, as in the Pope or a bishop, but in the assembly of the Church. For Paul in 1 Cor. 5, while wanting an incestuous man to be removed from the community, says: *When you are assembled, and my spirit is present, etc.*

But this Peter the martyr says in the same place that the death of Ananias and Sapphira, the blinding of Elymas and similar punishments inflicted by the apostles also pertain to the apostolic rod. But certainly Peter alone killed Ananias and Sapphira by his word, and Paul alone blinded Elymas, not the assembly of the faithful, which was not even consulted in these matters. Moreover, Paul alone handed him over to Satan, that is, excommunicated him, and he permitted Alexander and Hymenaeus to be harassed by the devil, as he says in 1 Tim. 1:20. And in 2 Cor. 13:2 he said: *I warn them that if I come again, I will not spare them.* And in the same place: *I write this while I am away from you, in order that when I come I may not have to be severe in my use of the authority which the Lord has given me.* Certainly the rod and authority are the same thing, and Paul says the authority was given to him, not to the assembly of the faithful. I omit that Ambrose alone excommunicated Theodosius, and we could cite almost an infinite number of similar examples.

And there is no obstacle to us in the expression, *when you are assembled, etc.* For, Paul does not want them to assemble in order to deliberate whether the incestuous man should be excommunicated, but to publicly and solemnly publish the excommunication; as also now solemn excommunications, when some persons are excommunicated by

name, are made known in the presence of the Church, but by the authority of the bishop alone. Therefore Paul even when absent, without the counsel or approval of the Church, had already decreed that that man should be handed over to Satan, and he writes to the Corinthians, not to consult them about this matter, but to command that the assembled Church should promulgate that he has been excommunicated.

The eighth place is 1 Tim. 3:2, where the Apostle establishes a law that bigamists are not to be ordained. It is evident that this law obliges in conscience, even though it is clearly positive and ecclesiastical. For it is clear both from the praxis of the Church, which has never dared to ordain husbands of two wives, and from the Council of Carthage IV, in canon 69, where a bishop, who knowingly had ordained a husband of two wives, was severely punished, for he was deprived of his authority of ordaining.

The ninth place is 1 Tim. 5:19: *Never admit any charge against an elder except on the evidence of two or three witnesses.* Here the Apostle teaches very openly that the bishop has his own tribunal also outside the forum of conscience, and like civil judges he can hear accusations and defenses, and judge according to the allegations and proofs. By the word "elders" here Chrysostom understands any senior man, whether a priest or a layman. From this we understand that laymen also are judged by the bishop in the external forum because of some crime. But Ambrose understands by the word "elder" a priest, and perhaps more correctly, however because of this explanation laymen are not excluded from the forum of the bishop, indeed they are clearly included. For the Apostle wants to say, as Ambrose explains it, that accusations against lay persons can be accepted and heard more easily; but against a priest, because of the dignity of holy orders, it should not be accepted, except on the testimony of two or three witnesses. Besides these places there are many others, which indeed are less pressing, but still do have their own efficacy.

The tenth place is Luke 10:16: *He who hears you hears me;* Cyprian in book 4, letter 9 and Basil in chapter 22 of the Constitution teach that this is to be understood properly to be about bishops.

The eleventh place is 1 Cor. 11:2: *I commend you because you maintain my traditions.* And 1 Thess. 4:2: *You know what instructions we gave you.* And in the same place: *Whoever disregards this, disregards not man but God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you.* And 2 Thess. 3:14: *If any one refuses to obey what we say in this letter, note that man, and have nothing to do with him.*

The twelfth place is Heb. 13:17: *Obey your leaders and submit to them; for they are keeping watch over your souls, as men who will have to give an account.* In writing about this text Chrysostom says that it is better not to have a leader, than to have one and not obey him; because those who do not have one, suffer only the loss of pastoral direction; but those who have one and do not obey him, suffer the same loss and also commit a sin, and will be punished by the Lord. Likewise Basil in chapter 22 of the Constitution, when explaining this text says that the Apostle added: *For that would be of no advantage to you,* to indicate a grave loss and a sin, and that a punishment will be imposed on those who do not obey their leaders. For in the Greek text there is no negative: *it would be of no advantage to you,* but it says positively, *it is unprofitable,* ἀλυσιτελες γαρ ὑμιν τούτο. Basil interprets this "unprofitable" or troublesome aspect to be the punishment

due because of the fault of transgression. And this is from the Scriptures.

Secondly, it is proved from the tradition of the Fathers, and first of all because there is almost no council which did not command something, or forbid under the punishment of an anathema or a deposition. Similarly, the letters of the Pontiffs, which are contained in the tomes of the councils or can be read in the body of canon law, are full of precepts and censures. We also have cited the principal places in the ancient Pontiffs—Leo, Gelasius, Hilary, Anastasius and Gregoiy—in book 2, chapter 29. Therefore omitting these, we will cite the testimonies of the older authors, about one ecclesiastical law only, which the heretics especially condemn, and what we will prove about that one law will apply to all the others.

Therefore, the adversaries admit that the law of fasting during Lent, or the ember days, or on vigils of feasts is clearly positive and ecclesiastical. But all the older authors teach that this law obliges the faithful in conscience, even without contempt of the law. Canon 68 of the apostles orders a cleric to be deposed, and a layman to be excommunicated if he does not observe the prescribed fasts. Likewise the council Gangrense in canon 19 orders those to be excommunicated who omit without necessity the prescribed fasts. And the council of Toledo VIII, in canon 9, deprives them of Holy Communion at Easter, and orders that those who have violated the Lenten fast must abstain from meat for a whole year. And please note that the council here does not say that this is because of contempt, but because of their intemperance they did not fast.

Basil in Oration 2 on fasting said: *All equally both hear the precept and accept it with joy.* And after that: *See to it that because of a small desire for food you do not incur some loss, and make yourself guilty of the crime of a deserter.* Chrysostom in his homily 6 to the people of Antioch said: *When the time of fasting comes, although someone is urget) a thousand times, and they torment and try to force him many times to drink wine, or tc taste something else forbidden by the law of fasting, he should prefer to suffer anything rather than to touch the forbidden food.* And in homily 2 on Genesis he says that Lent binds the conscience of all, even of Emperors, to obey it.

Ambrose in sermon 25 said: *It is not a slight sin for the faithful to violate the prescribed Lenten fast, and to excuse the hungry stomach from the holy fast.* Jerome in his letter to Marcella on the error of the Montanists: *We, according to the apostolic tradition (in which the whole world is at one with us), fast through one Lent yearly... Ido not mean, of course, that it is unlawful to fast at other times through the year— always excepting Pentecost — only that while in Lent it is a duty of obligation, at other seasons it is a matter of choice.* Note the expression "a duty of obligation." Augustine in sermon 62 on time said: *On other days the remedy or the reward is to fast, but in Lent it is a sin not to fast.* Leo in sermon 3 on the fasting of the tenth month said: *It is pious to do something not commanded, but it is impious to neglect what has been commanded.*

Finally, Epiphanius in heresies 75 and Augustine in heresies 63 place Arius among the heretics, because he said that it is indeed necessary to fast, but not because of the precept of the Church, but whenever anyone feels like it: *Fasting,* Arius said as quoted by Epiphanius, *will not be commanded, for such things are Jewish, and under the yoke of servitude, for a law was not imposed on the justified. But if I really want to fast, I will*

choose any day 'whatsoever for myself and I will be fasting because of my free choice. Lutherans are wont to hold the same position.

Thirdly, it is proved by reason. Some true laws in order to govern the Church well, besides the divine and civil laws, are necessary. But every true law has coactive power; therefore coactive ecclesiastical laws in the Church are necessary. However, there are not, nor were there ever in the Church any other ecclesiastical laws except those which the Sovereign Pontiffs, or the councils confirmed by them, promulgated. Therefore the laws of the Pontiffs and of those councils are coactive or binding laws, and so are truly and properly binding in conscience. But now the proposition and assumption of the first syllogism must be proved, for the other affirmations depend on it.

Therefore, it can easily be proved that some ecclesiastical laws are necessary. For, laws are necessary in the Church for the same reason they are necessaiy in all other republics. The reason why laws are necessaiy in every republic is because men, in order to live well, must live according to reason; however, since they are composed of body and spirit, and reason and feelings, they are hardly able to judge, without their emotions, according to the power of reason alone. Therefore, laws have been invented, which contain nothing but the judgment of reason, so that since men are forced to follow them, they are forced at the same time to follow reason. Now this rationale has its place also in the Church. For, although men by the grace of Christ have been freed from sin, still they have not been freed from concupiscence and the passions, which constantly are fighting against reason.

You will say: Christians have the evangelical law which they follow. I respond: They do have it, but it is too universal, and does not suffice to direct all our actions, unless by the determinations of ecclesiastical leaders in some way it becomes particular. Just as political republics also have the natural law, and nevertheless because it is veiy general, it is not sufficient, unless it is reduced to particulars by the determinations of the officials.

Therefore, as in a civil republic civil laws are necessary, which are certain quasi conclusions deduced from the law of nature, or determinations of natural law, so also in the Church, besides the evangelical law, ecclesiastical laws are necessaiy, which are also like conclusions or determinations deduced from the principles of the gospel. For example, the gospel says: *If anyone serves me, he must follow me,* and from that the Church draws as a conclusion: therefore it will be useful to make a law that those who do not want to be continent should not be admitted to the sacred ministry. Likewise the gospel requires that the Eucharist be taken, but it does not determine how or when; therefore the leader of the Church determines that at least during the Easter season it should be received, and the apostles establish a law that it should be received before eveiy other food, that is, while fasting.

Hence Augustine in letter 118, chapter 6, said: *The Lord did not prescribe in what order it should be received, and so he left this decision to the apostles, through whom he would govern the Churches.*

What remains now is to prove the assumption, namely, that every true law is coactive or binding. But this principle is taught clearly by St. Thomas in I-II, q. 96, a. 5 and II-II, q. 67, a. 1 and in his third lecture on Rom. 2, and it is also proved from the nature of law. For

a law is a certain rule of human actions established by God immediately or indirectly; but to deviate from a rule is to sin. Hence Aristotle in book 10, chapter 9 of the Ethics said: *Law is an ordination of reason which has coercive power.* Therefore the essence of law consists in the fact that it has the power of coercing and binding, so that it is a sin to act against it. Likewise the definition of sin manifests the same idea, for what is sin but the transgression of a law? For sin is defined in this way by the apostle in 1 John 3:4, ἡ ἁμαρτία ἐστιν ἡ ἀνομία. And it cannot be said that the law obliges not to despise it. For the law, which obliges one not to despise the leader, is a general and divine law. But what we are dealing with now is something particular and human, as when the Pontiff says, "fast during Lent"; that does not oblige you not to despise the superior, but it obliges you to fast.

CHAPTER XVII

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE ADVERSARIES TAKEN FROM THE SCRIPTURES ARE REFUTED

Now it is time to refute their arguments. They take their first one from Matt. 28:19-20: *Baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, teaching them to observe all that I have commanded you.* There they point out that it was not said, teaching your commands, but mine; then from that they deduce that it is not permitted for bishops to give precepts; this is the argument of John of Westphalia. I respond that in those things that the Lord commanded, this also is included that they keep the precepts of the bishops. For the Lord says: *He who hears you hears me.*

The second is from Deut. 4:2: *You shall not add to the word which I command you, nor take from it.* And chapter 12:32: *Everything That I command you, you shall be careful to do; you shall not add to it or take from it.* There he is speaking about ceremonial and judicial precepts. For, in chapter 4:1 he precedes with: *O Israel, give heed to the statutes and ordinances, etc.* And in chapter 12:1: *These are the statues and ordinances, etc.* Now if God commanded the Israelites to add no precept to those that are contained in the Scripture of the Old Testament, how much more is it to be thought that he commanded that Christians must not add anything to the gospel, which is much more perfect than the Old Testament? Luther, Calvin, and almost all the others make this argument. And Peter martyr made so much of it that in his Commentary on 1 Cor. 8 he wrote in the margin: Note, *this is a good argument.*

I respond that the addition or the removal of a precept can be understood in two ways. In one way, that a precept is added to a precept, as if to the number of ten precepts two other precepts were to be added, and they become twelve, or two precepts are removed from the ten and they become eight. In another way, that without the multiplication of the precepts, more or less is done than the precept requires; as if when God commanded for the Passover that one lamb was to be eaten by each family, a family would eat two lambs or only half of a lamb. Therefore I say that Scripture does not prohibit an addition of the first kind, but only of the second kind, that is, an addition to the number of precepts is not forbidden, but an addition to the work commanded; I can prove this because we find that the Jews added to the number of precepts, both ceremonial and judicial

There are many examples of the addition of ceremonial laws. For Est. 9:20 says: *Mordecai wrote that they should keep the fourteenth day of the month Adar and also the fifteenth day of the same, year by year, as the days on which the Jews got relief from their enemies.* And after that: *The Jews ordained and took it upon themselves and their descendants and all who joined them, that without fail they would keep these two days according to what was written and at the time appointed every year.* Likewise, 1 Macc. 4:59: *Then Judas and his brother and all the assembly of Israel determined that every year at that season the days of the dedication of the altar should be observed with gladness and joy for eight days.* Although this feast was new and added to the old one, the Lord also honored it by his presence, as is clear from John 10:22.

Concerning judicial laws, we have an example in 1 Sam. 30:25, where David

establishes a new law that an equal share of booty should go to those who went into battle and to those who stayed with the baggage: *And from that day forward,* Scripture says, *he made it a statute and a quasi law for Israel to this day.* There is no obstacle in the fact that he called is a "quasi law." For in the Hebrew it does not say "quasi law," but only ηπ ρπ!?, that is, *a statute and an ordinance;* these are the two words that are given in Deut. 4 and 12. Therefore, Scripture does not forbid new precepts to be added, but it forbids that anything be added to or taken away from the work itself, and this is confirmed. For, in Deut. 3 and 12 Moses does not address the leaders, whose function it is to make laws, but the people, whose role it is to obey. Therefore he commands only what was fitting to be prescribed for the people, that is, that they fulfill fully the prescribed work, neither adding to it or taking anything away from it. And Moses explains this more clearly in Deut. 5:32, where he was speaking about the same thing, and he said: *Do therefore as the Lord your God has commanded you; you shall not turn aside to the right hand or to the left.* For it is certain that Moses here is speaking about fulfillment of the precepts, not about making new laws.

But in this place it is to be observed, since Moses commands that nothing is to be added to what the law prescribes, this must be understood to be about a corrupting addition, but not about something perfecting the matte prescribed. For, since the law says: *Thou shalt not steal,* someone who not only does not take things belonging to others, but also gives his own possessions, does more than the law prescribes. But it does not say to add, because it does not destroy the precept, and actually it observes it better. But when the law says you are to sacrifice only clean sheep, and cattle and birds, if someone wants to sacrifice also dogs, and pigs and men, he is adding to and corrupting the precept. And this example is given in Deut. 12:31, where an addition is prohibited, namely, lest they sacrifice their sons, as the gentiles do.

Secondly, the argument can be answered, even if we admit that Scripture prohibits the addition of new laws. For, that prohibition should be understood to be about the addition of laws contrary to the prior laws, as St. Thomas rightly says in lessons 2 and 3 on Gal. 1 and is clear from the laws added later, as we have already shown.

Thirdly, it could also be said that the reason given in the Old Testament is not the same as the reason given in the New Testament. For, since the law of the Old Testament was given to only one people, and for a definite time, that is, until the coming of Christ, it could easily determine all things in particular, as it really did; for in particular, it prescribed everything that pertains both to the worship of God and to the administration of civil justice; and therefore it would not be surprising if it prohibited other laws to be added. But the law of the gospel is given for the whole world, that is, for the peoples of different nations, and it will continue until the end of the world. And therefore it was not so easy to determine everything in particular, so that other laws would not be further necessary, both civil and ecclesiastical; for, different peoples cannot agree on the same laws and forms of worship. Therefore, God judged it to be better, if in the gospel, which is common for all, he should hand on common laws on the sacraments and articles of faith, and to leave other more special things depending on the diversity of time and place to be instituted by the apostles and their successors.

Calvin takes his third argument from Isa. 33:22, where we read: *The Lord is our judge, the Lord is our ruler, the Lord is our king.* But it is clear from Jas. 4:12 that the words of Isa. are equivalent to what James says: *There is one lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and to destroy.*

I respond that Isaiah and James are speaking about the primary legislator, who by his own authority can judge and make laws; and we are not saying that the Sovereign Pontiff can do that, but only Christ; for we are not saying that the Pontiff is a king, or judge or primary legislator, but the vicar of the king and judge, and legislator, namely Christ, who can establish laws with the authority of Christ. St. Cyprian says the same thing in book 4, letter 3, where he says the Pontiff is the judge in the place of Christ.

But James while inquiring into this and saying: *There is one lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and to destroy,* is giving the reason why all men should keep the laws, and not make them. Therefore he excludes all other legislators, who want to obligate consciences, and destroy transgressors, and save the obedient. For he also says this: *Do not speak evil against one another. He that speaks evil against a brother or judges his brother, speaks evil against the law and judges the law,* that is, he who speaks evil against a brother doing good, so that he forgives injuries, *speaks evil against the law,* which commands that good: *For if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge. There is one lawgiver and judge, he who is able to save and to destroy.* There one proposition is understood in addition, after the words, *if you judge the law, you are not a doer of the law but a judge,* namely, this: But you must, O man, be a doer of the law, not a judge; and then the reason for this is added: *For there is one lawgiver and judge.*

I respond that James is addressing all men, inasmuch as they are subject to some laws, and wants to say that no one is allowed to judge the law of his superior, since there is only one lawgiver and judge so supreme and primary, so that he alone must make laws, but not receive them, and he can so destroy and save that he fears no one, and hopes for nothing from anyone. Indeed the Pope, and the other bishops, although they can judge and make laws, still they are also to be judged by God, and they must keep the laws of God.

Calvin takes his fourth argument from Isa. 29: *Because this people draw near with their mouth and honor me with their lips, while their hearts are far from me, and their fear of me is a commandment of men learned by rote; therefore, behold, I will again do marvelous things, etc.* There the Lord complains that the people of Israel feared a commandment of men, that is, fear and worship, and they established the religion of God in observing a commandment of men. Similar ideas are found in Matt. 15:8-9 and Mark 7:6-7.

I respond that the commandments of men in Scripture are not called just all the precepts of men, but only those that are totally human, so that they are in no way constituted either at the command of God, or his inspiration, or by his authority. And they are of two kinds: for, some are contrary to the divine commandments, and some are absolutely useless and vain. This is clear from all the place where human precepts are mentioned, for example in Isa. 29, Matt. 15, Mark 7, Col. 2, 1 Tim. 4, Tit. 1. In addition, the Lord is found three times reprimanding the Pharisees because of their human traditions. First, in Matt. 15,

where he argues that they observe human traditions against the law of God. For, in Matt. 15:3ff., after he had said that the Pharisees commanded that children may give to the temple what otherwise was owed to their parents, he added: *For the sake of your tra ition you have made void the word of God;* and immediately he quotes Isa. 29. There ore, . Irenaeus in his explanation of this place in Isa. and Matt, says that it is to e un ers oo about the precepts of the Pharisees that are opposed to the divine laws.

Secondly: In Mark 7 he reprimands the traditions, or precepts of men, that is, ce ain useless and frivolous ceremonies invented by the spirit of man alone. But the ews ma e so much of these that they put them before the divine commands, for examp e, w abandoning the command of God, they observe the traditions of men—washings ot jugs and goblets, and many other things like that. . .

Thirdly: In Matt. 23 he reprimands the same men because they consider certain g laws to be better than the divine law. There he does not call those laws precepts o me , but he says it is necessary to observe these, but not to omit the others. For they sin on y observing these ceremonies of the third kind, because they consider them to e t e of religion, although they are only external things. They were like the og o es , who because of the shadow of bread left the real bread, and as Irenaeus says eau i in book 2, chapter 12 about the Valentinian heretics, who preferred to have an ange their creator rather than God. .. t be

Moreover, pontifical and ecclesiastical precepts, although they can e sai human, because they are not immediately from God, nevertheless nowhere in cnp u are they called the precepts of men, nor can they be reproved, since they ° not con i with the divine commands, nor are they useless, and we do not say they shou e p a before the divine precepts, but after them. ♯ .

The fifth argument is taken from the words of Paul in which Christians are sai freed from the commands of men. 2 Cor. 3:17: *Where the Spirit of the Lor is, t ere i freedom.* Gal. 4:31; *We are not children of the slave but of the free woman, or free o Christ has set us free.* Gal. 5:1: *Stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yo of slavery.* . *A* .

I respond that Christian freedom consists of three things. First, in free om om slavery of sin, about which Paul speaks in Rom. 6:18: *Having been set free from sin, you have become slaves of righteousness.* . .

Second, in freedom from the slavery of the divine moral law. For, wit out grace law cannot be fulfilled; and still he threatens punishment, if it is not fulfilled, and su is presses and holds men like slaves; but the grace of Christ frees us from that fear, and slavery, not indeed by exempting us from the obligation of fulfilling the law, ut y mg us with charity, through which we are able to fulfill the law easily and willing y. is about this that the Apostle is speaking in 2 Cor. 3:17: *Where the Spirit of the Lord is there is freedom.* And also in Gal. 3:13: *Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us.* Hence Augustine said in chapter 3 of his book *On Continence*: *We are not under a law commanding something good but not giving the ability to do it, but we are under grace, which makes us love what the law commands, and moves us to do it freely-*

Third, in freedom from the slavery of the ceremonial and judicial precept of Moses, concerning which we read in Acts 15:10: *Why do you make trial of God by putting a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, etc.* And Gal. 5:1: *Stand fast therefore, and do not submit again to a yoke of slavery.* But we read nowhere that we have been freed from obedience to our bishops, but rather the contrary, since Paul cries out: *Obey your parents.*

Therefore Peter and Paul, foreseeing in the Spirit the heretics of this time who, under the pretext of freedom, can tolerate neither the fasts prescribed by the Church nor any other law, frequently want to insist that we show obedience even to our pagan superiors. 1 Pet. 2:13: *Be subject,* he said, *to every human institution.* And after that: *Live as free men, yet without using your freedom as a pretext for evil.* And in 2 Pet. 2:19 he said about heretics: *They promise them freedom, but they themselves are slaves of corruption.* And Paul in Gal. 5:13: *For you were called to freedom,* he said, *only do not use your freedom as an opportunity for the flesh.*

CHAPTER XVIII

THE ARGUMENT FROM THE COMPARISON OF LAWS IS REFUTED

The sixth argument. If God wanted Christians to be free from the Jewish ceremonies, and the other positive laws of the Old Testament, then he also wanted them to be free from the ceremonies which the Pontiffs introduced, and from other human laws. For, if we had to have positive laws, it would be better to have divine laws rather than human. Moreover, freedom from those Jewish laws would offer us no benefit, in fact it would rather be an obstacle. For those laws are said to be *an insupportable yoke* by St. Peter in Acts 15:10, both because of their large number, and because of their binding under sin; for otherwise the individual things in themselves were not grave, still less unsupportable. But the positive laws of Christians are ten times more than those were of the Jews, as is clear by comparing the volumes of canon law and the tomes of the councils, with the Pentateuch of Moses. Therefore if all those laws are binding under pain of eternal punishment, it would be much better for us to have the Law of Moses.

And Calvin confirms his argument with the testimony of St. Augustine, who in letter 119, chapter 19, complains about ecclesiastical rites rashly introduced, and he says: *Religion itself, which the mercy of God wanted to be free with very few and manifest sacraments of celebration, they oppress with heavy burdens, so that the condition of the Jews is more tolerable, who although they have not acknowledged the time of liberation, still they are subject to legal directives and not human presumptions.* These are his words. Calvin adds in book 4, chapter 10 § 13: *If that holy man lived in our century, with what complaints would he deplore the present servitude? For the number of laws is ten time greater, and the individual laws are a hundred times more demanding than formerly. This is wont to take place where those perverse lawmakers take over the power; they make no end of commanding and forbidding until they arrive at the summit of purity.*

I respond: Christ wanted us to be free from the ceremonial and judicial precepts of Moses, because those ceremonies were figures of the New Testament, and therefore, when the reality was present, they had to cease. Also the judicial precepts pertained to the polity of the people of God according to that state of affairs, and so, when that state changed, it was necessary also to change those precepts: *For when there is a change in the priesthood,* the Apostle said in Heb. 7:12, *there is necessarily a change in the law as well.* But it does not follow that we should have no political or ecclesiastical laws, if we are not required to have those of Moses.

To the objection about the number and gravity of the pontifical laws I respond: Without any comparison the pontifical laws are fewer and lighter than the Mosaic laws. For, there are hardly found laws absolutely imposed on all Christians other than four, namely, on observing the feast days, on observing the fasts, on making a confession at least once a year, and on receiving Holy Communion during the Easter season. All the others, of which the tomes of the councils or the books of canon law are full, either are not laws but admonitions, or pious instructions without binding under pain of sin; many of these are the rites of Christians. For they do not sin who, without contempt, either do

not recite the Angelus three times a day, or do not receive a palm or olive branch on Palm Sunday, or do not make a sign of the cross with holy water when they enter the church, or do not beat their breast at the time of the sacrifice, etc., and nevertheless Calvin complains that the Church is burdened with these and similar things. Many of the laws are either conditional, that is, imposed on those who want to be admitted to Holy Orders, like the rule of celibacy, which do not burden the Church, because no one is bound to become a cleric or a monk; or they are rules prescribed not for all, but only for ecclesiastical judges, so that they follow them in judging particular cases; or they are censures or punishments imposed on those who violate the divine law, without which discipline can in no way be preserved; or they are explanations of the dogmas of the faith, or of the divine law, which also do not impose any new burden on Christians. But the Mosaic laws, imposed on each and every Jew, were innumerable—on purifications, on sacrifices, on the choice of foods, etc. Therefore it is not right to compare the Pentateuch with the tomes of the councils and the books of canon law, but with the small catechism. For a Christian can be saved, if he knows only the small catechism.

But in what pertains to the gravity of the law, also there is no comparison between the severity of the Jewish laws, and the lightness of the ecclesiastical. For, of our four laws there is none which is not rather a determination of the divine law, than a completely new law. For, by the divine law we are bound to dedicate some time to the worship of God, and sometimes to fast, to confess and to communicate. Therefore the Pontiffs have determined only the times; and therefore if there is some difficulty in observing these laws, more concern is to be given to the divine law than to the positive law, and especially concerning the precept of confession, which is considered the hardest of all; for, the confession of sins is difficult for some, not because it must be made at a certain time, but because it absolutely must be done. There cannot be any doubt about this.

Then the determination of the time of feasts, and of fasts as determined by the Pontiffs, has a very light obligation. For, only those who can do it are obliged to fast; hence children, old people, those who are ill, etc. are exempted. Similarly on feast days we are required to abstain from servile work, and to attend Mass, but there are many exceptions; for, necessary works do not have to stop, or things that are very useful for human bodies, like the work of physicians, pharmacists, cooks, etc. Similarly, anyone who has a good reason for missing Mass is not judged to have committed a sin. But Jews were so severely bound to rest on the Sabbath that they could not even light a fire, or cook food; and someone who only gathered wood on the Sabbath according to the command of God was to be stoned to death.

To the quote from Augustine I say that Calvin maliciously wanted to twist the words of Augustine. For, he is not complaining about the rites instituted by the Pontiffs, but about certain particular customs of the common people, and of ignorant men, which gradually obtain the force of law and which, when they have increased too much, must be suppressed and abrogated by the authority of the bishops: *All such things,* he said, *which are contained neither in the authorities of the Holy Scriptures, nor are found decreed in the councils of the bishops, nor have been approved by the practice of the whole Church, but have great variety in the different customs of different places, so that scarcely or*

completely the reasons can never be found, which men followed in instituting them, without any hesitation I think that they should be suppressed by the proper authority. For although this cannot be found, how they are against the faith, nevertheless with heavy burdens they oppress religion itself, etc. as above.

Therefore you see that Augustine absolutely wants to preserve the laws that the bishops established in the councils, or the custom of the whole Church endorsed; all those laws that we call ecclesiastical are of this kind. For they are not contained in the tomes of the councils or in the books of canon law, if they were not passed by the bishops, but by some unknown private men.

CHAPTER XIX

THE ARGUMENT TAKEN FROM EXAMPLES IS REFUTED

Calvin takes the seventh argument from three examples, which are contained in Scripture. For, 2 Kings 16 recounts the fact of King Ahaz and the priest Uriah, who added to the temple another altar. Although it seemed to add to the adornment of the temple, still, because God had not asked for it, it was reproached as a human invention. Then in chapter 17 the book speaks about those whom the King of Assyria transferred from Babylon to Samaria, and that God sent lions to punish them because they worshipped God with new ceremonies, which God had not commanded. Finally, in chapter 21 there is a report about King Manasseh, who sinned gravely because he built altars in the temple, which in fact the Lord had not requested.

I respond that the impudence of Calvin is astonishing, since he teaches that Ahaz, and Manasseh, and the Babylonians sinned because they instituted ceremonies not commanded by God, since Scripture clearly states that all of them sinned by the sin of idolatry. For Ahaz is reprimanded not because he erected a new altar in the temple, but because he erected an altar like the altars of an idol, which was in Damascus, and because he moved the altar of the Lord from its usual place, and did not want sacrifices to be offered on the altar of the Lord, but only on the new altar consecrated to the idol. Manasseh also is not blamed because he erected altars in the temple, but because he built them for the whole army of heaven, that is, in honor of all the stars, and because he brought an idol into the temple of the Lord, which previously remained in a shrine of a high place.

For, that it was not an evil to erect another altar in the temple, even though the Lord had not commanded it, is clear from 1 Kings 8, where we read that Solomon, when he saw that the bronze altar of the Lord could not hold all the holocausts, which were being offered, consecrated another place in the temple, and there also offered holocausts. For God did not command or find fault with this action of Solomon, unless rather it should be said that he approved of it, since in the next chapter he appeared to Solomon a second time, and praised him, and promised to give him many good things.

In addition, it is certain that those Babylonians, who dwelt in the region of Samaria, were idolaters; for that is what Scripture says in 2 Kings 17:25: *And at the beginning of their dwelling there, they did not fear the Lord; therefore the Lord sent lions among them, which killed some of them.* And after that: *Every nation still made gods of its own, and put them in the shrines of the high places.* And after that: *So they feared the Lord but also served their own gods, after the manner of the nations from among whom they had been carried away to Samaria.* Therefore Scripture reprimands this sin, but not because they worshipped God with new ceremonies.

CHAPTER XX

TWO ARGUMENTS TAKEN FROM THE NATURE OF CONSCIENCE ARE REFUTED

The eighth argument of Calvin is that Paul in no way permitted the faithful to subject their consciences to the slavery of men. For he says in 1 Cor. 7:23: *You were bought with a price; do not become slaves of men.* There Paul is not commanding that slaves should not obey their masters in external things; for in Eph. 6:5 he says: *Slaves, be obedient to those who are your earthly masters, with fear and trembling.* Nor does he command that those who are free should become slaves; for in the same 1 Cor. 7:21 he says: *Were you a slave when called? Never mind. But if you can gain your freedom, avail yourself of the opportunity,* that is, although you could be free, it is better for you that you remain a slave, and use your servile condition in order to preserve humility. Therefore the result is that he forbids the service of men with the fear of sin, and anxiety of conscience, since it is necessary to serve God alone.

I respond that Paul in this place is commanding only that we should not serve men principally because they are men, but for the sake of God, so that we serve God more in men, than the men themselves. For thus Paul explained himself in Eph. 6:5-7 when he said: *Slaves, be obedient to those who are your earthly masters, with fear and trembling, in singleness of heart, as to Christ; not in the way of eye-service, as men pleasers, but as servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart, rendering service with a good will as to the Lord and not to men.* Therefore those become servant of men (which the Apostle forbids) who look especially at men, and therefore serve them even if they command sins, and praise them, even when they do evil. See Chrysostom on 1 Cor. 7 and Jerome on Eph. 6.

Calvin's ninth argument. Conscience pertains to the forum of God alone, for he is the one who reads minds and hearts; therefore men cannot bind in conscience. I will now confirm this argument. A man cannot damn someone to hell; therefore he cannot obligate anyone to observe the law under pain of eternal death. For it would be ridiculous, if someone obligated another to a punishment, which afterwards he could not inflict.

I respond in two ways that it can be understood that conscience pertains to the forum of God alone. In one way, because only God can see the consciences of men, and judge their internal acts, which are not evident exteriorly, and do not have other witnesses except God and the conscience of the one acting; and in this way it is true that conscience pertains to the forum of God alone. But it can be understood in another way that conscience pertains to the forum of God alone, because only God can so bind man by his laws that if he does not do what has been commanded, he will judge in his own conscience that he has done evil; and in this way it is false that conscience does not pertain to the forum of men. For, in order for someone in this way to oblige another in conscience, it is not required that he be able to see his conscience, nor to read his mind and heart, nor to judge about his internal acts, but it is enough that he be able to give him a legitimate command, and by commanding in this way to obligate him to do the external work, so that if he does not do it, he understands, or certainly can understand that he has acted badly.

Therefore, John Calvin in book 4, chapter 10 § 5 is deceived by an equivocation, or he wants to deceive others, when he says this: *Concern about our consciences is not something for men, but only for God; the common distinction between an earthly forum and the forum of conscience is to be made here. Since the whole world is covered by a dense fog of ignorance, nevertheless this small spark of light remains, and it acknowledges that the conscience of man is above all human judgments. Although what they confessed with one word, afterwards they actually weakened; nevertheless God wanted some testimony of Christian freedom to appear, which would exempt consciences from the tyranny of men.* These are his words.

But when we say that conscience is above all human judgments, we want to say nothing other than that the man, who is fully aware of himself, should not fear that he will be damned by God, even if all men, who do not see the heart, perhaps judge otherwise about his deeds. But to what is the meaning of this? Is it that he will not sin, because by the testimony of his own conscience he has violated only ecclesiastical laws?

For a confirmation I respond that a human law does not oblige under pain of eternal death, unless by reason of the violation of a human law God is offended, whose ministers are all leaders, not only ecclesiastic but also political. For, just as he who transgresses the laws of the king's representative, consequently offends the king, and can be punished by the king, even with a penalty which the king's representative perhaps could not inflict, so also he who does not observe the just laws of leaders, who indeed are ministers of God (see Wis. 6, Rom. 13, 1 Cor. 4) also offend God, and are punished by him with the pain of eternal death. Therefore if we imagine that God is not in the nature of things, the one who will violate just laws surely will sin in his conscience, but he will neither offend God, not be condemned to hell.

You will say: If that is true, it follows that a human law as human does not obligate in such a way that transgressors are said to sin mortally. I respond: If you understand a human law as human to be one which properly is not made by God, I deny that a transgressor of a human law as human does not sin mortally. But if you understand a human law as human to be one which a man makes with his own authority, but not with authority received from God, or he makes it with an authority conferred by men only, I admit that the transgressors of such a law do not sin mortally. Moreover, that kind of law is no law; for all true authority is from God (Rom. 13:1), and without true authority no true law can be established.

CHAPTER XXI

ARGUMENTS FROM THE FATHERS ARE REFUTED

The tenth argument is taken from some testimonies of the Fathers, which John a Turrecremata in the name of others mentions in book 2, chapter 45. The first is Origen in tractate 12 on Matthew where, while explaining the saying in Matt. 20:25: The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them, but it shall not be so among you, went on to say: *Just as all carnal things are placed in necessity, not in the will, but spiritual things in the will and not in necessity, so also is it with spiritual rulers. Their leadership should be based on the love of their subjects, not on bodily fear.*

I respond that Origen does not exclude coactive power from an ecclesiastical ruler, but only warns such officials about their duty. For there is this difference between a secular ruler and an ecclesiastical, that the secular ruler has for his purpose the temporal and external peace of the republic, and therefore he has obtained his end when his subjects live in peace, whether they do it willingly or unwillingly. But the spiritual ruler has for his purpose eternal life and the peace of his subjects that is both external and internal; therefore he should fully bring it about that his subjects are led more by love than by fear, although when he cannot obtain that they live well freely and from love, he must also use coactive power so that at least out of fear of punishment they do not disturb the external peace. Hence Gregory in book 20, chapter 6 on Morality said: *Regarding their subjects, in rulers there should be both mercy dealing with them justly, and discipline directing them dutifully, etc.*

The second is from Chrysostom in book 2, near the middle, on the priesthood, where he compares the Pontiff with the shepherd of irrational sheep, and he says: *For a man is not permitted to care for other men with as much authority as a shepherd cares for sheep. For the latter is free to fetter them, to prevent them from eating, to roast them, and to kill them, while for the former the ability to administer medicine or a cure is in no way located in the one who uses the medicine, but only in the one who works, etc.* Then he compares the same Pontiff with a secular magistrate, and he says the following: *It is not permitted for Christians to correct the faults of all sinners by force. Indeed foreign judges when they capture wicked men who have broken the laws show themselves to be endowed with great authority and power, and they force them against their will to change their habits. But here it is necessary not to use force, but only to persuade, and for this reason to get a better result when someone must be corrected. For such capability has not been given to us by the laws to coerce those who are delinquent; and even if they did not give it, we would have it where we can exercise force and power of this kind, since Christ will give an eternal crown not to those who are forced, but to those who firmly abstain from sin.*

John a Turrecremata responds that Chrysostom is speaking about those who are outside, that is, about pagans whom the Church cannot force to accept the faith. But Chrysostom speaks very openly about the sheep which are within, and which have been entrusted to the bishop. Therefore it must be said that Chrysostom never wants to deny

the coactive power of the Pontiffs, since he clearly asserts it everywhere. For, in homily 70 to the people he forbids Christians subject to him to summon a woman to ciy at a funeral, and he says: *I will not force them to bewail true and proper evils.* And after that: *No one should despise ecclesiastical punishments. For the one who imposes them is not a man, but Christ, who conferred this power on us, and made us lords of such great honor.* And in letter 1 to Pope Innocent he asks him to punish with ecclesiastical laws bishop Theophilus of Alexandria, and the others, by whom he had been unjustly expelled from his diocese. And in homily 83 on Matthew, addressing a deacon he said: *If any leader, if a consul, if the one wearing the crown, approaches unworthily, stop him and turn him away. You have more authority over him, but if you do not dare to turn him away, speak about it to me, and I will not allow that to happen.* We have the fact, therefore, that Chrysostom thought that the prelates of the Church can bind their sheep, and expel from the Church, and punish severely, which previously he seemed to have denied.

To those words, therefore, I respond it two ways. First, between a shepherd of irrational sheep and a shepherd of rational sheep this distinction is made by Chrysostom, namely, that the former, when he is dealing with the natural ills of the sheep, can heal his sheep even if they are unwilling; but the latter, because he is dealing with the ills of sheep having free will, he cannot cure them unless they will it, and so the situation of the latter is more difficult than that of the former. And there is a similarity here with secular authorities. For, a secular judge is dealing with external actions, and so he can force a man against his will to change his habits, that is, his external acts; but a bishop is dealing with internal habits, which cannot be changed against the will of the one who has them. For, although a bishop can excommunicate, and inflict other punishments, still those things will accomplish nothing, unless the one who is punished wills to change his ways. And this is the way I understand those words: *For such capability has not been given to us by the laws to coerce those who are delinquent.* For a bishop does not have the capability of forcing a man to change his mind, as a secular judge has of forcing a man to change his external way of life. Secondly, it can be said that Chrysostom in this place is dealing only with priestly power in the internal forum of conscience; for there we cannot correct a penitent, unless he himself wills it; for, the most that we can do is to send him away without absolution.

The third testimony is that of Augustine in book 22, chapter 27 in his work against Faustus, where he gives this definition of sin: *Sin is a word, or deed, or thought against the eternal law of God.* For from this it is deduced that the transgression of a human law is not a sin. The definition is similar of Ambrose in chapter 8 of his book on Paradise: *Sin,* he said, *is the breaking of a divine law.* I respond that every sin is against the law of God, not the positive, but the eternal, as Augustine rightly teaches. For, every just law, whether it is given by God or by man, is derived from the eternal law of God; for it is the eternal law that it is evil to violate a rule.

The fourth testimony is that of St. Bernard in book 1 on Consideration. *Those who say this,* he said, *will not be able to show where at some time one of the apostles sat as a judge of men. I read that the apostles stood while judging; I do not read that they judged while sitting down.* I respond: St. Bernard here is speaking about a judgment in civil

cases; for, elsewhere in the same place he says this: *Surely they think little of judging the little earthly possessions of men, who will be judging angels and heavenly things. Therefore your power is over crimes, not over possessions, since you have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven because of the former, not because of the latter.* You can add to this that Bernard is not arguing so much about whether it is permissible for the Pontiff to judge earthly disputes, but about whether it is fitting for him to do so.

CHAPTER XXII

THE LAST QUESTION IS PROPOSED: DOES CHRIST CONFER ECCLESIASTICAL JURISDICTION IMMEDIATELY ON THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF ALONE?

The last question remains on the derivation of ecclesiastical power from the Sovereign Pontiff to the other bishops. It should be known that there is a threefold power in the Pontiff and in the other bishops: one of orders, another of interior jurisdiction, a third of exterior jurisdiction. Of these the first refers to the conferring and administering of the sacraments; the second to ruling the Christian people in the internal forum of conscience, the third to ruling the same people in the external forum.

Our question does not concern the first and second powers, but only the third. For, concerning the first, it is certain among all that the bishops and the Sovereign Pontiff himself have it in the same way immediately from God; for it is conferred by a definite consecration, which operates equally in one and in the other. On this power see John a Turrecremata in book 1, chapter 93. Concerning the second there is a certain disagreement among the authors, for Abulensis, in the book which he calls *Defensorium,* in part 2, chapter 63, thinks that this power is conferred on all priests immediately by God, when they are ordained. But that nevertheless every priest cannot absolve, or bind, just any Christians whatsoever, is the standing rule, because the Church, in order to avoid confusion, has divided the world into dioceses, and subjects one people to one bishop, and another to another. But John a Turrecremata in book 1, chapter 96 of his Summa teaches that this power is not conferred by God from the power of ordination, but by man through a simple enjoining or command. But both sides agree that the use of this power depends on exterior jurisdiction, and so it will be enough for us to treat that exterior aspect.

Therefore it is necessary to treat only the third power, which we also considered in the preceding questions. And in fact all agree that episcopal jurisdiction, at least in general, is of divine law; for, Christ himself arranged the Church in such a way that in it there should be pastors, doctors, etc. For thus the Apostle says to the Ephesians in 4:11: *And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some pastors and teachers.* Moreover, if that were not the case, then the Pontiff could change this arrangement, and institute that there will be no bishops in the Church, which without doubt he cannot do. But the question is—whether bishops canonically chosen receive their jurisdiction from God, just as the Sovereign Pontiff receives it, or from the Pontiff. But on this matter there are three opinions of the theologians.

The first is of those who say that both the apostles and the other bishops have received and do receive jurisdiction immediately from God. This is taught by Francis Victoria in reperusal 2, question 2 on the power of the Church, and by Alphonse a Castro in book 2, chapter 24 on the just punishment of heretics. The second is of those who say the apostles received their jurisdiction not from Christ but from Peter, and the bishops not from Christ but from Peter's successors. This is taught by John a Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 54 of his Summa on the Church, and by Dominic Jacobatius in book 10, article

7 on the Councils. The third is the middle position of those who say that the apostles indeed received from Christ immediately all their authority, but that bishops receive it not from Christ but from the Sovereign Pontiff. Thus Cajetan in chapter 3 of his treatise on the authority of the Pope and the Councils, Dominic a Soto in 4 dist. 20, question 1, art. 2, Francis Vargas in his small book on this very question, Hervaeus in his book on the power of the Pope, and Gabriel in lesson 3 on the canon of the Mass, and the same opinion seems to have been held by the old Scholastics, like St. Bonaventure, Albert, Durandus and others in their comments on 4 dist. 18, or 20 or 24; this opinion is the true one and so it will be confirmed briefly.

CHAPTER XXIII

THE APOSTLES RECEIVED ALL JURISDICTION FROM CHRIST

Therefore the apostles received their jurisdiction immediately from Christ. First of all, the Lord's words prove this in John 20:21: *As the Father has sent me, even so I send you.* The Fathers, Chrysostom and Theophylact, explain this text in the sense that it clearly states that by these words the apostles were made vicars of Christ, indeed that they received the office and authority of Christ.

Cyril adds in this place that by these words the apostles were really created apostles, and teachers of the whole world, and that we should understand that all ecclesiastical power is contained in the apostolic authority. Therefore Christ added: *As the Father has sent me,* since the Father sent the Son endowed with supreme power. Cyprian in his book on the unity of the Church said: *The Lord says to Peter, I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and he says the same thing after his resurrection, Feed my sheep. And although after his resurrection he gives equal power to all the apostles, and says: As the Father has sent me, even so I send you, still in order to provide unity, he established one Chair, etc.* There you see that the same thing is given to the apostles by the words, *I send you,* which had been promised to Peter by the words, *I will give you the keys;* and afterwards it was conferred by the words, *Feed my sheep.* But it is certain that through the words, *I will give you the keys,* and by the expression, *feed my sheep,* the fullest jurisdiction is to be understood But we have shown elsewhere how this does not negate the Primacy of Peter.

Secondly, the election of Mathias to the apostolate shows the same thing. For, in Acts 1 we read that the apostle Mathias was not chosen by the apostles, nor did they give him any authority, but having implored and sought his election from God, he was numbered immediately among the apostles. Certainly if all the apostles had their jurisdiction from Peter, he would have to manifest that in the choice of Mathias.

Thirdly, it is proved from Paul, who openly teaches that he had his authority and jurisdiction from Christ, and from that he proves that he is a true apostle. For in Gal. 1:1 he says: *Paul an apostle—not from men nor through a man, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father.* And in the same place in order to show that he did not receive his authority from Peter, or the other apostles, he says: *But when he who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace,.. I did not confer with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia, and again I returned to Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas, etc.* And in chapter 2:6: *Those who were of repute added nothing to me.*

Fourthly, it is proved by evident reason. For, the apostles were created by Christ alone, as is clear from Luke 6:13: *He called his disciples, and chose from them twelve, whom he named apostles.* And in John 6:70: *Did I not choose you, the twelve?* But that the apostles had jurisdiction is clear both from the deeds of Paul, who in 1 Cor. 5 excommunicated someone, and in 1 Cor. 6, 7, 11, 14, and elsewhere passim, established

laws, and because the apostolic dignity is the first and supreme dignity in the Church, as is clear from 1 Cor. 12:28 and Eph. 4:11: *And God has appointed in the Church first apostles, second prophets, etc.* See St. Thomas on 1 Cor. 12. It is not surprising that before the passion they were apostles, but they were not yet bishops, or priests, and they did not have any jurisdiction. For the Lord at different times conferred on the apostles different powers; and especially in John 20 he completed what he had begun before the passion.

CHAPTER XXIV

ALL BISHOPS RECEIVE THEIR JURISDICTION FROM THE POPE

But that all ordinary jurisdiction of bishops comes immediately from the Pope is proved first of all from the figure of the Old Testament. For, in Num. 11:16ff. we read that, when Moses could not alone rule the whole people, God ordered him to assemble seventy elders, and taking from the spirit of Moses, he gave it to them so that together with Moses they would govern the people. There it should be noted with Augustine, in question 18 on the book of Numbers, that the taking of the spirit from Moses does not signify a lessening of the spirit in Moses, for then it would have been no benefit for Moses to have helpers, if because of that he was made weaker, but it signifies the derivation of the power of the elders from the power of Moses; for God wanted to show that the fullness of power resided in Moses, and that the others, if they have some, have it from Moses. But it is certain that the Pontiff has the same place in the Church that Moses had among the Jewish people.

Secondly, ecclesiastical government is monarchic, as we showed above; therefore all authority is in one man, and it is derived from him to others; for all monarchies are like that. They will respond that the ecclesiastical government is monarchic, but moderated by the aristocracy; and so besides the monarch, that there are also other lower prefects, who are not vicars of the supreme monarch, but absolute rulers; but they would be vicars, if they received their authority from him.

But that is not the case. For the aristocracy of the Church required indeed that the bishops be leaders, and not simple vicars, but it does not require that those leaders be appointed by God and by the Pontiff, but only that the Pontiff is required by divine law to establish different ecclesiastical leaders in various parts of the Church. It is as if somewhere a king were bound to appoint in the individual provinces not magistrates or protectors, but true governors or princes, who rule the province as their own, but with dependence on the king.

Thirdly, it is proved from the four similitudes, which Cyprian uses in his book on the unity of the Church, where he compares the chair of Peter to a head, a root, a fount, the sun. For, in every body the power of the members is derived from the head, in eveiy tree the power of the branches comes from the root, in every river the water comes from a fount, and finally, the light of the sun's rays comes from the sun.

Fourthly, it is proved from the inequality of jurisdictions. For, if God immediately conferred jurisdiction on the bishops, all bishops would have equal jurisdiction, as they have equally the power of Orders. For God never determined the jurisdiction of bishops; but one bishop has one town, another has a hundred towns, another many provinces; therefore, jurisdiction of this kind is conferred not by God, but by man. Therefore, one rules a small community, another rules a large community, because that was the choice of the one who gave the jurisdiction, that is, the leader of the whole Church.

Fifthly, if the bishops had their jurisdiction from God, the Pontiff could not remove it, or change it; for the Pontiff cannot do anything contrary to the ordination of God. But

it is certain that the Pontiff can do that, and has done it often. Hence St. Bernard in letter 131 to Mediolane said: *The Roman Church can establish new dioceses where previously they did not exist; of those existing, she can suppress some and she can elevate some, as it seems good, so that she can raise a bishop to be archbishop, or she can do the opposite, if it seems to be necessary.*

They will respond that bishops have jurisdiction from God, but under the Pontiff; and so the Pontiff can remove it or change it.

But that is not the case. For, the apostles had their power under Peter, but since they had it immediately from Christ, Peter could not remove it or diminish it. Furthermore, they have the power of Orders from God, so the Pontiff cannot take it away in such a way that they, if they so will, cannot use it. For a priest, even if the Pontiff should excommunicate, suspend or degrade him, still can, if he wishes, truly consecrate. Finally, in any city the clergy and the people are subject to the bishop, but nevertheless if one of the priests, or a lay person, has immediately from the Sovereign Pontiff some authority, the bishop cannot take it away or diminish it. In the same way, therefore, if the bishops had their authority from Christ, the vicar of Christ could not take it way or diminish it. Now the adversaries may say: there the Lord subjected the bishops to the Pontiff in such a way that he also wanted those things to be able to be changed, which he conferred on them.

They respond that the Pontiff can at least remove the matter subject to the bishop, that is, to subject his people to another bishop, and in this way he does not really take the jurisdiction from him that was given to him by God, but he brings it about indirectly that he loses it. But since the power of jurisdiction signifies a relation of a prelate to a subject, and in relative things when one term is posited or removed, the other is also posited or removed, if jurisdiction cannot be taken away from a bishop, it cannot happen that the people would not be subject to him. And finally, it would be truly astonishing, if divine providence, which disposes all things sweetly, did not will that jurisdiction should be given by him through whom he willed that it can be increased, diminished and also totally removed.

Sixthly, if bishops have their jurisdiction by divine right, they should produce some word of God, on which this jurisdiction of theirs is founded. But the adversaries produce nothing, nor can they produce anything, except the words of the Lord addressed to the apostles; but with those words ample jurisdiction in the whole Church is given to the apostles, which certainly the adversaries do not concede to bishops. Therefore, they should examine the reasons on which they base their opinion.

Seventhly, there are the weighty testimonies of two ancient and very holy Pontiffs. Innocent I in a letter to the council of Carthage, which is 91 among the letters of Augustine, said: *The episcopate is from Peter, and all authority comes from his name.* And in his letter to the council of Mileum, which is 93 among the letters of Augustine, he said: *I judge that all our brothers and fellow bishops ought to have recourse to Peter, that is, to the bearer of his name and office.* Leo in sermon 3 on his elevation to the episcopate said: *If he wanted the other bishops to have something in common with him, he never would have given only through him what he did not give to the others.* And in letter 89: *The Lord*

wanted the sacrament of this office so to pertain to the office of all the apostles, that in blessed Peter, the head of all the apostles, he placed the sacrament principally, so that from him as from the head he might pour out his gifts into the whole body.

There is no problem here in the fact that the apostles did not get their jurisdiction from Peter. For here Leo is speaking about the ordinary way in which God confers his gifts on the leaders of the Church, that is, the bishops, and he says they are ordinarily conferred by Peter. But the apostles received their jurisdiction by an extraordinary privilege from Christ.

Finally, there are the words of the Pontiff, which he uses in creating bishops. For he offers this prayer: *We are providing this person for this Church, and we set him over it as father and pastor, and bishop of the same Church, and we are committing to him the administration of it in temporal and spiritual matters, in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.*

CHAPTER XXV

THE ARGUMENTS OF THE ADVERSARIES ARE REFUTED

Their first objection is that our opinion destroys itself. For, bishops succeed the apostles, just as the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter; therefore if the apostles have jurisdiction from Christ, as our first conclusion asserts, it follows that the bishops also have it from Christ, which the second conclusion denies. And on the other hand, if bishops have jurisdiction from the Pontiff, as our second conclusion asserts, then the apostles have it from Peter, but the first conclusion denies this. For, a successor has his jurisdiction from the one from whom his predecessor had it, otherwise he does not truly succeed, but he is installed according to another order. But Augustine teaches that bishops succeed the apostles in his commentary on Ps. 45:16, for when he is explaining the words: *Instead of your fathers shall be your sons,* he said: *the apostles were sent as fathers, and for the apostles sons were born and were constituted bishops.* Hence also the Council of Florence in the Decree for the Armenians, and the Council of Trent in session 23, chapter 4 teach that the bishops succeed in the place of the apostles.

I respond that there is a big difference between the succession of Peter and the succession of the other apostles. For, the Roman Pontiff really succeeds Peter, not as an apostle, but as the ordinaiy pastor of the whole Church. Therefore the Roman Pontiff has jurisdiction from the one from whom Peter had it; but bishops do not succeed apostles in the proper sense, since the apostles were not ordinary, but extraordinary, and something like delegated pastors, to which there is no succession.

However, the bishops are said to succeed the apostles, not properly in the way in which one bishop succeeds another, and one king another, and this for two reasons. First, by reason of the episcopal holy Orders. Secondly, by a certain similitude and proportion, because, namely, just as when Christ was living on earth, the first ones under Christ were the twelve apostles, then the 72 disciples; so now the first ones under the Roman Pontiff are the bishops, after them are the priests, and then the deacons, etc.

Now we will prove that the bishops succeed in this way and not otherwise. For, they do not participate in the true apostolic authority. The apostles could preach in the whole world, and establish Churches, and it is clear from Matt. 18 and Mark 16 that bishops cannot do this. Similarly, the apostles could write canonical letters, as all admit; bishops cannot do this. The apostles had the gift of tongues and miracles, which the bishops do not have. The apostles had jurisdiction in the whole Church, and bishops do not have that. Moreover, there is no proper succession, except in an empty diocese. But apostles and bishops existed together at the same time in the Church, as is clear concerning Timothy, Titus, Evodius, and many others. Therefore if bishops succeed apostles, which apostle did Titus succeed? Or Timothy? Finally, bishops succeed the apostles in the same way in which priests succeeded the 72 disciples, as is clear from Anacletus in letter 3, and Bede on Luke 10; but it is certain that priests do not succeed properly the 72 disciples, but only by a certain similarity. For, those 72 disciples were not priests, nor did they receive any order or jurisdiction from Christ. We know this because Philip and Stephen, and the other

five deacons ordained by the apostles (see Acts 6) were from among the 72 disciples, as Epiphanius teaches in heresies 20, which is about the Herodians; but certainly they would not have been ordained deacons, if they were already priests.

Their second objection is based on Acts 20:28: *Take heed to yourselves and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit has made you guardians, to feed the Church of God.* Likewise in Eph. 4:11 : *He gave some apostles, some pastors, some teachers.* In that place under the name of pastors and teachers bishops are understood, as Jerome explains in his comments on this place. And this is confirmed from the Fathers, for Dionysius in chapter 6 of his book on the hierarchy of the Church says that the hierarchy of the bishops is terminated immediately in Jesus, just as the lower orders or priests, deacons, and others are terminated in the bishop. Cyprian in book 3, letter 9 to Rogatianus says the bishops are from Christ, who created the apostles, but the deacons are from the apostles and were not instituted by Christ. Bernard in book 3 on Consideration said: *You are in error if you think that your supreme apostolic power was instituted only by God.*

I respond to the first place that the bishops are said to be constituted by the Holy Spirit not immediately, but indirectly; because the apostles, being inspired by God and having accepted power from the Holy Spirit, constituted them bishops. As also they say in Acts 15:28: *It has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us. There is no authority except from God* (Rom. 13:1), that is, indirectly or immediately.

To the second place I say that there the general order of the Church is being expressed, which without doubt is of divine law. For, God is the one who established that in the Church there will be apostles, prophets, pastors and teachers, although he does not give authority immediately to all.

To the third I say that Dionysius is speaking about the order of bishops, not about jurisdiction.

To the fourth I say that Cyprian means that the order of bishops was instituted by Christ himself. Therefore they were introduced into the Church by divine law, but the order of deacons was instituted by the apostles. The school of theologians generally rejects the second part of this opinion, but whether it is true or false, it makes no difference with regard to out thesis.

To the fifth I say that Bernard is speaking in the same way in which Paul says in Rom. 13:1: *There is no authority except from God.*

Their third objection: If bishops have jurisdiction from the Pontiff, then when the Pontiff dies, the authority of bishops ceases, as when the head is cut off all the members of the body die. I respond that there is a big difference between a natural head and the mystical head, since the members of a natural body cannot stay alive, unless they receive continual influx from the head; but the members of the mystical head, especially ministerial and external, depend indeed on the head to be, but not to be preserved in existence. Therefore, episcopal jurisdiction once conferred is not lost by the death of the one who gave it, but by the death of the one who received it, or because it is removed by the one who can remove it.

Their fourth objection: Jurisdiction is necessary in order to exercise the order of the episcopate. Therefore God, who confers the order, also confers jurisdiction. I respond

that both are conferred by God, but one immediately, the other indirectly, because one part, that is, the power of Orders requires the character and grace, which only God can give; the other part, that is, jurisdiction requires only the will of the superior.

Their fifth objection: The Sovereign Pontiff calls the bishops his brothers and colleagues; therefore they are put in charge of the Church by one common God the Father. I respond that they are called brothers first of all by reason of the episcopal ordination, in which they are all equal. Secondly, by reason of jurisdiction, because the bishops are joined to himself by the Pontiff in order to sustain and promote his own task, not to some inferior ministry.

The sixth objection: If all the bishops must accept jurisdiction from the Pontiff, then many bishops were not bishops, because the Roman Pontiff has not created all the bishops, especially in Asia and Africa. I respond that it is not necessary that the Pontiff create the bishops immediately, but it is sufficient if he does it indirectly, that is, through patriarchs and archbishops. Therefore, in the beginning Peter established the patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch; when they had received authority from the Pontiff, they presided over almost all of Asia and Africa, and they could create archbishops, who afterwards created bishops.

BOOK FIVE

On the temporal dominion and power of the same Pontiff

CHAPTER I

A QUESTION IS RAISED ABOUT THE TEMPORAL POWER

The final part remains of the discussion concerning the Pontiff, which is about his temporal power, and on this question there are three opinions of the authors. The first is that the Sovereign Pontiff by divine right has full power in the whole world, both in ecclesiastical matters and in political matters. This is taught by Augustine Triumphus in the Summa on the power of the Church, question 1, article 1, Alvarus Pelagius in book 1, chapter 13 on the lamentation of the Church, and by many lawyers, like Hostiensis in the chapter "Quod super his, de voto et voti redemptione," Panormitanus in the chapter "Novit, de iudiciis," Sylvester in the Summa, § 2, and not a few others. Actually, Hostiensis even goes further. For he teaches that by the coming of Christ all dominion of pagan princes has been transferred to the Church, and resides in the Sovereign Pontiff, as the vicar of the supreme and true king, Christ. And so he claims that the Pontiff can give the kingdoms of infidels to whomever of the faithful he wishes.

The second view is not so much an opinion as it is a heresy and it takes the opposite extreme, and teaches two things. First, that the Pontiff as pontiff, and by divine right, has no temporal power, nor can he in any way command secular princes, nor can he deprive them of their kingdoms and powers, even though otherwise they deserve to be deprived. Second, it teaches that the Pontiff and other bishops are not permitted to accept the temporal power, which they now have in some cities and provinces, whether this power was given to them or they usurped it. For, the divine law forbids that the spiritual sword and the temporal sword be given to one man at the same time. Thus, all the contemporary heretics teach this, and especially Calvin in book 4, chapter 11 § 8 to 14 in his Institutes, and Peter martyr on Rom. 13, and Brentius in the Prolegomena against Peter a Soto; but the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 1, book 2, chapter 4, col. 435 place among the signs of the Antichrist that the Pontiff carries two swords, no matter how he acquired them. And then in Centuries 8, 9, 10 and 11, chapter 10 on the lives of the Pontiffs he reprimands them especially for this reason.

The third opinion is in the middle, and is held commonly by Catholic theologians, namely, that the Pontiff as pontiff does not have any temporal power directly and immediately, but only spiritual power; however, by reason of the spiritual at least indirectly he has some power, and it is supreme, in temporal matters. Thus Hugo of St. Victor in book 2, part 2, chapter 4 on the sacraments, whom Alexander of Hales follows in 3 par. Summa, q. 40, m. 5, and 4 par., q. 10 in his explanation of the canon of the Mass. And for any king likewise St. Bonaventure in his book on the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, part 2, chapter 1; Durandus in his book in his book or the origin of jurisdiction, q. 3 at

the end; Peter of Alliaco in the question of whether the Church of Peter is confirmed in the faith; John of Paris in the treatise on royal and papal power, chapter 6 and 7; Jacob Almair in the treatise on the supreme power of the Church, chapter 6; Gabriel Biel in his explanation of the canon of the Mass, lesson 23; Henry of Gandavo in Quodlibet 6, q. 23; John Driedo in book 2, chapter 2 on the freedom of Christ; John a Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 113 of his Summa; Albert Pighius in book 5 on the hierarchy of the Church; Thomas Waldensis in book 2 on the teaching of the Faith, article 3, chapters 76-78; Peter of Palude in his book on the power of the Church; Cajetan in the Apology, chapter 13 ad 8; Francis Victoria in repurusal 1, q. 6 on the power of the Church; Dominic a Soto in 4, dist. 25, q. 2, at. 1; Nicholas Sanderus in book 2, chapter 4 on the visible monarchy; Anthony of Cordova in book 1, q. 57, dub. 3, and many others.

What St. Thomas thought about this matter is not fully certain. For, at the end of his comments on 2 Sent, he says that the apex of both powers is in the Pope. However, in his commentary on Rom. 13 he says that clerics are exempt from taxes by a privilege of secular rulers; and in II-II, q. 40, a. 2 he says that bishops can take part in wars only inasmuch as they are providing some spiritual good, which is the purpose of their power. From these comments it is gathered that he does not disagree with the other theologians.

Therefore we will treat three things. First, we will show that the Pontiff by divine right does not have temporal power directly. Second, he does have in some sense, that is, by reason of his spiritual monarchy, supreme power that is also temporal. Third, it is not against the divine law that bishops have also actually and directly temporal jurisdiction over cities and provinces given to them by kings, or acquired in some other just way.

CHAPTER II

THE POPE IS NOT LORD OF THE WHOLE WORLD

Concerning the first point, we will treat three things in order. First, that the Pope is not the lord of the whole world. Second, he is not the lord of the whole Christian world. Third, he is not the lord of any province, or city, and he has no merely temporal jurisdiction by divine right. John a Turrecremata teaches the first point expressly in book 2, chapter 113 of his Summa on the Church. *The Pope,* he said, *should not be said to have jurisdiction in temporal matters by right of the papacy in such a way that he is said to be the lord of the whole world.* So also Francis Victoria in reperusal 1, question 6 on the power of the Church. *The Pope,* he said, *is not the lord of the world.* Others teach the same thing, and here is the proof. The Pope is not the lord of those provinces, which the infidels control; for, first of all, the Lord in John 21:17 committed to Peter only his sheep. Then, the Pope cannot judge infidels, 1 Cor. 5:12: *What have I to do with judging outsiders?* Finally, infidel leaders are true and supreme leaders of their own regions; for, power is not based on grace, or faith, but on free will and reason; and it does not come from divine law, but from the law of nations, as is clear because God approves the kingdoms of the Gentiles in both Testaments. Dan. 2:37: *You are the king of kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom, the power, etc.* Matt. 22:21: *Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesar* k Note the word "render," not donate what belongs to Caesar, that is, the things justly due to him; and Rom. 13:7: *Pay all of them their dues, taxes to whom taxes are due, revenue to whom revenue is due, etc.* And in the same place he also commands, for the sake of conscience, to obey pagan princes; but certainly we are not bound in conscience to obey someone who is not a true official.

Therefore if the Pope is not lord of those provinces, which the infidels control, it follows that he is not Lord of the whole world, unless those provinces are said not to pertain to the world. They will say: we are bound to obey pagan princes, because all princes are vicars of the Pope. But that is not correct, the Pope does not wish to have such vicars, and if he could, he would willingly give the kingdoms of infidels to Christian princes. But it is ridiculous to say that God gave the Pope the right over the kingdoms of the whole world, and did not give him any capability of using that right.

But, they will say, the Pope is the spiritual monarch of the whole world; and still he could never exercise this power over the whole world. I respond that the Pope can be said to be the spiritual monarch over the whole world, not that he presides over all men, who are on earth, but that he presides over all Christians spread throughout the world. And again, even on this hypothesis, indeed, because if the whole world were converted to the faith, the Pope would preside over the whole world simply by reason of his spiritual jurisdiction. Finally, he has the right of sending preachers of the gospel throughout the whole world.

But Alexander VI divided the recently discovered world between the kings of Spain and Portugal. I respond: He did not divide it with the purpose that those kings should go there to wage war against the infidel kings of the new world, and occupy their kingdoms,

but only so that they would bring preachers of the Christian faith to them, and to protect and defend both the preachers and the Christians converted by them. And he did it also to impede disputes and wars between the Christian princes, who wanted to do business in those new regions. On this see Cajetan 22, q. 66, art. P, and Victoria in reperusal of the right of war, and Soto in book 4 on justice and right, q. 2, art. 2, and in 4 Sent. dist. 5, q. 1, art. 10 ad arg. 5.

CHAPTER III

THE POPE IS NOT LORD OF THE WHOLE CHRISTIAN WORLD

Now, concerning what was proposed in the second place, namely, that the Pope is not lord of the whole Christian world, Hugh of St. Victor teaches this in book 2, par. 2, chapter 4 on the sacraments. *Earthly power,* he said, *has the king as its head; spiritual power has the Sovereign Pontiff.* And it is stated clearer by John Driedo in book 2, chapter 2 on freedom. *Christ,* he said, *when he chose Peter as the pastor of the whole Church, did not at the same time give him temporal power over the whole Church, for he did not take their kingdoms away from emperors and kings, nor did he also will that all royal and ecclesiastical power should be derived from the power of Peter.* The same opinion is held by many others, and it is proved first of all, because if that were the case, indeed even by divine right as they say, then it would have to be proved from the Scriptures, or certainly from the tradition of the apostles. But on this we have nothing from the Scriptures, except that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to the Pontiff. But there is not mention of the keys of the kingdoms of the earth; and the adversaries have not been able to produce any apostolic tradition. Furthermore, Christ did not remove, nor does he take away the kingdoms to whom they belong. For, Christ did not come to destroy things that are working well, but to perfect them. Therefore, when a king is a Christian, he does not lose his earthly kingdom, which he justly obtained, but he acquires a new right to an eternal kingdom; otherwise the benefit of Christ would cause damage to kings, and grace would destroy nature. This is confirmed by the hymn of Sedulius, which the whole Church sings publicly:

Herod, you impious enemy,
Why do you fear the coming of Christ?
He who gives heavenly kingdoms
Does not tear away mortal ones.

Likewise, if the Pope is the supreme lord of the whole Christian world, then the individual bishops are temporal rulers in the towns subject to their episcopate, since that which the Pope is in the whole Church, each bishop is in his particular Church, that is, just as the Pope is a true pastor, and head of the whole Church, so the bishop is a true pastor and head of the particular Church. But we do not deny that the Pope has more authority over the whole Church than a bishop has over the particular Church. But the adversaries do not concede that bishops are lords of the cities of which they are bishop, and it is openly false. Hence Ambrose in his Oration on the Basilica: *If the Emperor,* he said, *asks for tribute, it is not denied, the fields of the Church will pay the tribute.* And after that: *Is it tribute for Caesar? It is not denied. The Church belongs to God, and it is not to be handed over to Caesar.* And in the letter of Athanasius on leading a solitary life, the bishop Hosius says to the Emperor: *God gave you the empire, but Christ gave us what pertains to the Church.*

Finally, it is proved from the confession of the Pontiffs. Leo in letter 38 to Martianus, confesses that the Emperor Martianus was chosen by God for the empire, and in letter 43 to the same person, he confesses that God is the author of the empire of Martianus. And he writes similar things in almost all the letters to Theodosius and Martianus, emperors succeeding each other. Gelasius in the letter to the Emperor Anastasius, which is contained also in Decree 96 in the canon "Duo sunt": *There are two,* he said, *August Emperor, by whom principally this world is ruled—the sacred authority of the Pontiffs and the royal power, etc.* There it is to be noted that Gelasius is not speaking only about the administration, but about the power itself and the authority, lest the adversaries should say (as they often do) that the Pope indeed had both powers, but he requires the administration from others.

Gregory in book 2, letter 61 to Mauritius said: *Power over all men has been given by God to the piety of my lords.* And in a clearer way Nicholas in a letter to the Emperor Michael said: *Do not impose an investigation on the Church of God. For she imposes no investigation on your empire.* And after that: *The same mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, so proclaimed the duties of both powers by his own acts and with different dignities, that Christian emperors need the Pontiffs for their eternal life, and the Pontiffs make use of the imperial laws for the care only of temporal things.* Here also the Pontiff is speaking not about the administration alone, but about power and dignity.

Moreover, Alexander III in the chapter "Si duobus," when asked whether an appeal to a secular judge is binding on the Pope, responded: *It is binding on those who are subject to our temporal authority; but in other things according to the rigor of the law we believe it is not binding.* Likewise in that chapter "Causam 2" he said: *We direct out attention to what pertains to the king, but not to the Church in the judgment about such possessions.*

Finally, Innocent III in the chapter "Novit" said, "We cannot sufficiently take care of our own jurisdiction, so why would we want to usurp someone else's?" There the Pontiff is speaking about the usurpation of foreign jurisdiction, if he should try to assume jurisdiction in the kingdom of the Franks. And after that he said that we do not intend to pass judgment on a feudal benefice, which pertains to his judgment, but to pass judgment on sin, the censure of which doubtless pertains to us. The same Pope in the chapter "Solitae" said: *For the support of heaven, that is, of the universal Church, God made two great lights, that is, he established two dignities, which are the pontifical authority and the royal power, but the former, which rules the days, that is, the spiritual, is greater, but what is fleshly is lesser, and as a great difference is known between the sun and the moon, so also it is known between Pontiffs and kings.* Note there how a star, the sun and the moon are not the same; and just as the sun did not create the moon, but God did, so also the pontificate and the empire are not the same, nor does one depend absolutely on the other. The same Pope in the chapter "Per venerabilem" says that the Pontiff alone in the patrimony of the Church has full power in temporal matters. But in other regions it is not the same, and in the same place he said: *Since the king in no way recognizes a superior in temporal affairs, without the violation of that law he could subject himself to our jurisdiction in a matter in which it would seem to others he could easily do so (not like a father with sons, but as a prince with his subjects.*

CHAPTER IV

THE POPE DOES NOT HAVE ANY PURELY TEMPORAL JURISDICTION DIRECTLY BY DIVINE LAW

[NOTE: This distinction on power in temporal matters directly or indirectly is found also in the Gloss in the chapter "Novit, on the judgment of a feudal benefit"; Innocent also follows this in the same place, where he says that the Pope does not judge feudal benefits directly, but he does so indirectly by reason of sin.]

Now it remains for us to demonstrate that the Pope directly and in no place has temporal power by divine right. This is taught expressly by John a Turrecremata in book 2, chapter 114 on the Church, Cajetan in the Apology, part 2, chapter 13 ad 8, and Navarrus in the chapter "Novit," note 4. Here are the words of Cajetan: *The power of the Pope directly is with respect to spiritual things regarding simply the end or purpose of the human race. Therefore two things pertain to his power—first, that it is not direct with respect to temporal things; second, with respect to temporal things it is ordered to their spiritual dimension.* And this is clearly proven for the following reason: Christ as a man, and while he lived on earth, did not accept, and did not want a merely temporal power over a province or town; but the Sovereign Pontiff is the vicar of Christ, and he represents Christ for us, as he was while he lived here among men. Therefore, the Sovereign Pontiff as the vicar of Christ, and as he is the Sovereign Pontiff, does not have purely temporal power over any province or town.

Both propositions of this reasoning must be proved. And first of all, the first proposition must be explained and proved. For, from this false proposition—that the man Christ was a temporal king—two contrary errors have been born. For, from this certain authors conclude as from a special foundation that the Pope, who is the vicar of Christ, is at the same time both king and Pontiff; contrariwise, the Wycliffites (as Waldo says in book 2 on the doctrine of the faith, art. 3, chapter 76) deduce from this same principle that kings are greater and worthier than Pontiffs, because kings are vicars of Christ the King, and Pontiffs are vicars of Christ the Pontiff. But Christ was more a king than a pontiff, because he descended from the royal tribe of Judah and the family of David, not from the tribe of Levi and the family of Aaron; and therefore by his hereditary succession he was king, not a pontiff.

Therefore, in order that this principle may be explained and proved, I say that Christ was indeed always as the Son of God, the king and lord of all creatures in the same way as his Father is, but that this kingdom is eternal and divine, and that it neither takes away the powers of men, nor can it pertain to the pontiff; moreover, that Christ was as man the spiritual king of all men and he was over all the faithful and infidels in reference to their eternal salvation, so that he could oblige them to accept the faith and receive his sacraments; that he could also by his spiritual power make use of all temporal things, as he judged necessary for his spiritual end; also that after the day of judgment this spiritual kingdom of Christ will be sensible and manifest, and so that the glory of this kingdom was begun in Christ our head, when he resurrected from the dead; also that this

will not be a temporal kingdom, as they are of our kings, nor can it be communicated to the Pontiff, because it presupposes the resurrection; finally, that Christ the man, if he had willed it and if it had seemed to him necessary, could have received royal authority; however, that he did not will that, and therefore neither accepted nor had not only the administration of power and a kingdom, but also no authority or power of any temporal kingdom; and this is proved. For if he had, it would be either from hereditary succession, or from election, or from right of war, or from a special gift of God; for every kingdom is acquired in one of these ways, either by heredity, or by election of the people, or by right of war, or by the gift of a superior.

For, Christ the man had a hereditary kingdom; for although he descended from a royal family, still it is not certain whether he was closer to David than many others, who belonged to the same family; and also at that time the kingdom had been taken away from the family of David, and that was by the will of God, who also had foretold that no future king, that is, temporal king, would come from the family of Jechoniah, from which Christ descended, in the way in which David and his successors had descended. In Jer. 2 . on Jechoniah we read this: *Thus says the Lord: Write this man down as childless, a man who shall not succeed in his days; for none of his offspring shall succeed in sitting on t e throne of David, and ruling again in Judah,* But it is certain from Matt. 1:12 that Christ descended from this Jechoniah.

From this it clearly follows that Christ could not have a temporal kingdom y hereditary succession, unless the prophecy were false, which in clear words had foretol that no one of the descendants of Jechoniah after that time would ever have power in Judah. And it cannot be responded that the descendants of Jechoniah had his kingdom, but did not actually sit on the throne of David. For, what is the value of a right, which they could never make use of? And this is confirmed from the Fathers. For Jerome in his comments on this place and Ambrose in book 3 on Luke 1 ask how this prophecy of Jeremiah does not conflict with the prophecy of Gabriel the Archangel, who says in Luke 1:32: *The Lord will give to him the throne of his father David?* And they respond that there is not conflict, because Jeremiah is speaking about a temporal and carnal kingdom, Gabriel about a spiritual and eternal kingdom. Augustine agrees with this in book 17, chapter 7 in *The City of God,* when he says: *This people was about to lose the kingdom, Christ Jesus our Lord being about to reign, not carnally, but spiritually.*

Christ also was not a temporal king because of an election, as is clear from the words in Luke 12:14: *O man, who made me a judge or divider over you?,* that is, neither the emperor nor the nation has appointed me to be a judge. And from this text in John 6:15: *Perceiving then that they were about to come and take him by force to make him king, Jesus withdrew again to the hills by himself* Therefore it is obvious that he did not want to accept his election to be a king.

But he was also not a temporal king by the right of war; for his war was not with mortal kings, but with the prince of darkness, as is clear from John 12:31: *Now shall the ruler of this world be cast out.* And in Col. 2:15: *He disarmed the principalities and powers and made a public example of them, triumphing over them in him.* And in 1 John 3:8: *The reason the Son of God appeared was to destroy the works of the devil.* Therefore

by right of war Christ obtained for himself a spiritual kingdom, so that he might reign in our hearts through faith and grace, where before the devil reigned through vices and sins.

Finally, that he was not a temporal king by a special gift of God is clear from these words in John 18:36: *My kingship is not of this world.* And in the same place: *My kingship is not from the world.* For as the Fathers explain this, like Chrysostom, Theophylact, Cyril and Augustine in their comments on this place, and Ambrose in book 3, near the end, on Luke, the Lord with these words wanted to free Pilate from the suspicion, which might cause him to think that Jesus wanted to establish a temporal kingdom. Therefore the meaning is: *I am indeed a king, but not in the way in which Caesar and Herod are kings; for my kingdom is not from this world, that is, it does not consist of honors, riches, and worldly power, etc.* And this reason is confirmed first of all by the testimony of many authors. For, it is taught by St. Thomas in his commentary on John 18, St. Bonaventure in the book on the poverty of Christ and in the Apology of the poor, Augustine of Ancona in q. 1, art. 9 on the power of the Church, Cornelius Jansen on Luke 1:32, *The Lord will give to him the throne of David;* and Adam Sasbout on Isa. 9, Thomas Waldensis in book 2, chapters 76-78 on the doctrine of the faith, Alvarus Petagius in book 2, chapter 57 on the lamentation of the Church, Durandus in the treatise on the origin of jurisdiction, question 3; John Driedo in book 3, chapter 4, par.1 on the dogmas of the Church, Abulensis in question 67 on Matt. 20, Albert Pighius in book 5, chapter 3 on the ecclesiastical hierarchy, Adrian Finns in book 5, chapter 6 on the punishment of the Jews, Victoria in reperusal 1 on the power of the Church, Soto in book 4, q. 4 on justice and law, Bartholomew Medina on III, q. 59, art. 4, Navarrus on the chapter "Novit," notab. 3, num. 97. Finally, almost all the interpreters of John 18: *My kingdom is not of this world.* It is confirmed, secondly, because Christ never exercised royal power in this world; for he came to serve, and not to be served; and to be judged, and not to judge. Therefore he would have received royal authority in vain, for that power is in vain that is never reduced to act.

I respond that Christ exercised this power when he drove out of the temple the sellers of sheep and oxen (John 2:15). But primarily to drive someone out of the temple is not the duty of a king, but of the priests. For if the priests by force ejected the king himself, namely, Uzziah, from the temple (2 Chron. 26:20), could they not much more easily eject some merchants? Moreover, it should be noted that Christ did not eject those men from the temple, as it were with priestly or royal power, but in the way of the prophets, with a certain divine zeal, by which Elijah killed the prophets of Baal. And because of that the Jews said to the Lord: *What sign have you to show us for doing this?,* that is, how do we know you are a prophet, and have been sent by God with such power?

Thirdly, the same reason is confirmed. For, royal authority was not necessary for Christ, nor was it useful, but plainly superfluous and useless; for the purpose of his coming into the world was the redemption of the human race; but for this purpose temporal power was not necessary, but only spiritual power, since with that spiritual power he could also make use of all temporal things in the way he judged necessary for human redemption. But that such purely temporal power would have been useless for Christ can be understood from the fact that Christ had to persuade men concerning the contempt of glory, of pleasure, of riches and of all earthly things, but the kings of this world especially

abound in these things: *Those who wear soft raiment are in kings' houses* (Matt. 11:8).

Fourthly, it is confirmed from the fact that Christ was truly a poor man, not only regarding the use, but also the dominion over things, as St. Bonaventure proves from the Scriptures in his book on the poverty of Christ. Nicholas III also defined this in the chapter "Exiit" on the meaning of the word, where he says that Christ taught by word and example the poverty of religious, which lacks all dominion over things. Also Clement V on the meaning of the word "Exivi" says that Christ was an exemplar of a heavenly life, as it is described in the rule of St. Francis.

John XXII is not opposed to this in the Constitution "Quia quorumdam"; for he contends that Christ had at times small places, and dominion in common with the apostles over the money that was given to them as alms; but he does not deny that sometimes Christ had nothing, not even in common. And he teaches openly that Christ taught by example the religious life, which lacks all dominion at least over particular things. But if Christ sometimes lacked all dominion, how was he always the temporal Lord of all things?

Finally, it is confirmed from the fact that almost every place in Scripture, where it is treating the kingdom of Christ the texts must necessarily be understood to be about a spiritual and eternal kingdom; and so it cannot be deduced from Scripture that there was any temporal kingdom of Christ. Ps. 2:6 treats the kingdom of Christ, where it says: *I have set my king on Zion, my holy hill;* and immediately there is the addition: *I will tell of the decree of the Lord,* to show that it is a spiritual kingdom. Likewise in Dan. 2:44: *And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed.* And in Luke 1:33: *And of his kingdom there will be no end.*

But temporal kingdoms are not eternal, and if Christ was the king of the Jews in a human way, while he lived on earth, certainly he ceased to reign in that way when he ascended to the Father. Therefore, how can it be that there will be no end of his kingdom? And since the same kingdom was occupied shortly thereafter by the Romans, then by the Saracens, and now is held by the Turks, how has what Daniel said been fulfilled that his kingdom would not be handed over to another people? Therefore, Christ was not the temporal king of the Jews, but the spiritual king of the Church. The temporal kingdom of David and Solomon was a figure of his kingdom; for this reason the Father gave Christ the throne of David his father that he should reign in the house of Jacob forever.

Now the assumption of the first argument is to be explained. We say, therefore, that the Pope has the office that Christ had, when he lived on earth among men in a human way; for we cannot attribute to the Pontiff the offices, which Christ has as God, or as an immortal and glorious man, but only those that he had as a mortal man. For since the Church, composed of men, needs a visible head, and one living in a human way, therefore Christ, when he ceased to live in a human way, that is, after his resurrection, left Peter in his place, who would show us the visible and human governance of Christ, which the Church had before Christ's passion; this is clear from the words in John 20:21: *As the Father has sent me, even so I send you.*

There is the additional point that the Pontiff does not have absolutely all the power that Christ has as a mortal man. For he, because he was both God and man, had a certain

power, which is called a power of excellence, through which he presided over both the faithful and the unbelievers; but to the Pope he committed only his sheep, that is, the faithful. Moreover, Christ would institute sacraments, and perform miracles by his own authority, which the Pontiff cannot do. Likewise he could absolve from sins without the sacraments, which the Pope cannot do. Therefore he committed to the Pontiff only that power which could be committed to a mere man, and which was necessary in order to so govern the faithful that without any impediment they could obtain eternal life. Therefore it follows evidently from this that Christ as a mortal man did not have a temporal kingdom, nor that the Pontiff, as the vicar of Christ, has any such kingdom.

CHAPTER V

THE CONTRARY ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

But there are those who raise objections about this. First, there are the words of the Lord in Matt. 28:18: *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me;* for from this it seems to be concluded that Christ had a spiritual and an earthly kingdom. And he gave the keys of both kingdoms to Peter, as Nicholas says in his letter to the Milanese and is contained in the decree dig. 22, canon "Oves": *Christ,* he said, *gave the rights of both the earthly and the heavenly kingdom to Peter, the key-carrier of eternal life.*

I respond that the power about which the Lord is speaking here is not a temporal power, like that of earthly kings, but it is only spiritual, as St. Jerome and St. Anselm explain, who say that this is the meaning of those words, *All authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me,* that is, so that just as I am king of the angels in heaven, so by faith I rule over the hearts of men, or (as Theophylact adds) it is a supreme power over all creatures, which is not temporal but divine, or it is similar to the divine power, which cannot be communicated to mortal men.

Regarding the words of Nicholas, I say that the meaning is this: Christ gave to Peter rights over both the earthly and the heavenly kingdom, that is, Christ conceded to Peter that what he bound or loosed on earth, would be bound or loosed also in heaven. For, Nicholas is alluding to the words of the Lord in Matt. 16:18. And we cannot explain it otherwise, unless we want to put Nicholas II in opposition to Nicholas I, who in his letter to Michael clearly teaches that Christ distinguished between the acts, offices and dignities of the Pontiff and the Emperor, lest either the Emperor would presume to usurp the rights of the Pontiff, or the Pontiff the rights of the Emperor.

Secondly, they raise an objection from Luke 22:38, where the Lord conceded two swords to Peter. For, when the disciples say: *Look, Lord, here are two swords,* the Lord does not say, "That is too much," but "It is enough." Therefore St. Bernard in book 4 on Consideration and Boniface VIII in the Bull *"Unam Sanctam,"* deduce from this text that the Pontiff has two swords from the institution of Christ.

I respond that literally there is no mention in this text of the gospel about a spiritual or temporal sword of the Pontiff, but only that the Lord with these words wants to warn the disciples that in the time of their own passion they will be in the same troubles as those also are wont to be who sell their tunic so they can buy a sword, as is gathered from Theophylact and other Fathers. In addition, St. Bernard and Pope Boniface have interpreted this text in a mystical way, and they do not want to say that the Pontiff has both swords in the same way, but he has one in one way and the other in another way, as we will explain later.

The third argument. All Controversies and contentions, both spiritual and temporal, pertain to the judgment of the Sovereign Pontiff; for that is contained expressly in the canon "Quicumque litem," and in the canon "Quaecumque contentiones" 11, question 1.

I respond that of those canons the first one is that of the Emperor Theodosius, who because of his piety, not from any obligation, conferred that honor on the Church.

Moreover, by that canon it was granted not only to the Roman Pontiff, but to all the bishops that they could judge civil cases, which were brought to them. Finally, now this has been abrogated by other canons, as the gloss in the same place says. It is certain that the second canon is not from that leader who could make laws, but from a particular bishop, of uncertain authority, and because of that the word *"Palaea"* should be noted; and also it could be understood in a good way, that is, to be about all contentions which cannot be handled by the secular judges, either because the judge does not want to administer justice, or the other party does not want to cooperate; for then the cases are brought to the judgment of the Church by way of fraternal correction, as Innocent III rightly teaches in the chapter "Newness in judging."

The fourth argument. When the throne of the Emperor is empty, the Sovereign Pontiff succeeds in administration, and he uses the imperial power, until a new emperor is elected, as is found in Innocent III in the chapter "Licet," and from the Council of Vienne. Therefore this is a sign that the imperial power emanates from the Sovereign Pontiff as from the supreme temporal lord.

I respond that the Pontiff succeeds the Emperor, when the throne is empty, not in all things, but only in the authority of judging and terminating those cases which customarily are judged only by the Emperor, and which cannot easily be delayed. But the reason for this is not because the Pontiff is the supreme temporal ruler, but because all those cases, which cannot be decided by temporal judges, are brought to the spiritual judge, as we will explain below, and we have already said partially.

The last argument. St. Thomas in book 3, chapters 10 and 19, on the government of princes says that the Sovereign Pontiff by divine right has spiritual and temporal power in the whole world, as the supreme king of the whole world, so that he can also impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy cities and fortresses for the protection of Christianity. St. Thomas also says the same thing in 2 Sent. dist. 44 near the end: In the Pope there is the summit of both powers, spiritual and temporal. Many other doctors follow St. Thomas, so that this can be said to be a common opinion among theologians. I respond: Not without good reason some learned men have doubts about the author of the books on the government of princes, which are found among the small works of St. Thomas. For many things indicate that St. Thomas is not the author of these books, but especially what is had in book 3, chapter 20 on the succession of the Emperors Adolph and Albert. For the author of these books writes that at his time it happened that Adolph succeeded Rudolph, and Albert succeeded Adolph. But it is certain that St. Thomas died in the year of salvation 1274, but Adolph succeeded Rudolph in the year 1292, and Albert succeeded Adolph in 1299, and in these calculations of the times there are no disagreements among the chronologists. Therefore it is not possible that St. Thomas was the author of those books, since he died so many years before the reign of Adolph and Albert, unless perhaps that narration was inserted into the works of St. Thomas afterwards by someone else.

But whoever the author of those books was, he does not seem to disagree with our opinion, unless perhaps in his way of speaking. For although sometimes he says that the Sovereign Pontiff has power over all temporal things, nevertheless in many places he explains himself, and teaches that the power of the Sovereign Pontiff per se and

directly is spiritual, but that he can through it dispose concerning the temporal things of all Christians, when it is required for the purpose of spiritual power, to which are subordinated the end of all the temporal powers. Therefore he says this in book 1, chapter 14: Therefore the service of this kingdom (namely the spiritual which Christ instituted), as spiritual things are distinct from the earthly, has been committed not to earthly kings, but to priests, and especially to the supreme priest, the successor of Peter, the vicar of Christ, the Roman Pontiff, to whom all the kings of the Christian people must be subject, just as they are to the Lord Jesus Christ. For thus they should be subject to him to whom the care of the final end pertains, to whom the care of the preceding ends pertains, and to be directed by his command. He clearly distinguishes earthly kingdoms, which have for their end temporal peace, from the spiritual kingdom of Christ and his vicar, which has for its end eternal life. Again, the same author in book 3, chapter 13 said: It is sufficiently apparent that the power of Christ is ordered to the salvation of souls, and to spiritual goods, although it is not excluded from the temporal in the way in which it is ordered to the spiritual goods. The same author said in book 3, chapter 15: There is another reason why our Lord assumed a humble state, even though he is lord of the world, namely, in order to point out the difference between his power and that of other princes; for although in a temporal way he is Lord of the world, still he ordained his primacy directly for the spiritual life. These are his words with which he is saying that Christ did indeed have temporal power over the whole world, but indirectly. But directly he had only spiritual power; therefore in the same book 3, chapter 19 that author does not say that the Sovereign Pontiff can absolutely impose taxes on all Christians, and destroy cities and fortresses, but only in the situation in which the preservation of Christianity requires it. In order to do that, the ample spiritual power in the whole Christian world, which the Sovereign Pontiff has, is sufficient.

But to what St. Thomas writes in 2 Sent. dist. 44, namely, that the summit of both powers is in the Roman Pontiff, that is, spiritual and temporal, a response can be given in two ways. First, St. Thomas is speaking about the power, which the Roman Pontiff has in the temporal sovereignty of the Roman Church. For he had said shortly before that, in the things pertaining to the salvation of the soul, more obedience should be shown to the spiritual power than to the secular. But on the other hand, in things pertaining to the civil order more obedience should be shown to the secular power than to the spiritual. Then he adds an exception, unless by chance the secular power is joined to the spiritual power, as in the Roman Pontiff, in whom is found the summit of both powers. For, the Roman Pontiff is not only the pastor of the Church, but he is also the secular ruler of many provinces. Therefore, in those provinces, both in spiritual matters and in secular affairs, more obedience is to be shown to the Sovereign Pontiff, than to any other power, whether spiritual or secular.

Secondly, it can be responded that St. Thomas wants the summit of both powers to be in the Pope with regard to the whole Christian world, but not in the same way: for the summit of spiritual power is in him directly, and per se; but the summit of secular power is in him indirectly, and consequently. For it is not probable that St. Thomas thought that in merely civil matters more obedience should be shown to the Sovereign Pontiff than to

one's own king, even in the provinces at the time not subject to the Roman Church. For the contrary is openly gathered from the responses of the Pontiffs themselves quoted above; and St. Thomas doubtless is not contradicting them. Therefore St. Thomas wanted only this, namely, that also in civil matters more obedience is to be shown to the Sovereign Pontiff than to the secular ruler, if the salvation of souls depends on those civil matters; but not absolutely, since it is joined to the ample spiritual power of the Sovereign Pontiff, at least indirectly and consequently, the ample power of setting in order the temporal affairs of all Christians, as we will demonstrate in the following chapter. Furthermore, I am convinced that this is the mind of St. Thomas—both what we noted above, that is, the testimony of Thomas by which he says that clerics are exempt from taxes by a privilege of the secular princes, and the agreement of the followers of St. Thomas. For I see that with a great consensus the opinion of St. Thomas is taught by his disciples, which attributes to the Pontiff power in temporal affairs only indirectly and consequently, as is evident from Peter de Palude, John a Turrecremata, John of Paris, Thomas Cajetan, Francis Victoria, Dominic a Soto, Bartholomew Medina, and others, and it is not in any way credible that, in such an important matter, they would want to depart from the path of St. Thomas.

And it would not be difficult to bring other theologians, who seem to defend the contrary opinion, back to a certain agreement with the others. For, even Augustine Triumphus himself, who seems openly to attribute to the Sovereign Pontiff temporal power in the whole world, still explains himself in question 1, article 7 on the power of the Pontiff in response to the last question; there he says the temporal power is in the Pontiff in a different way than it is in the king. For, in the Pontiff it is present in order to confirm and correct, but it is in the king as being in the administrator. And he writes more clearly in article 9 that the Pope has spiritual power, but by it he can also arrange temporal things. And in article 9 he demonstrates that Christ was not a temporal, but a spiritual king.

Similarly, Alvarus Pelagius seems, in part 1, article 13 of his work on the lamentation of the Church, to want to show that both Christ and his vicar are a temporal king of the whole world; nevertheless, in part 2, article 17 of the same work he teaches both openly and copiously that Christ on earth did not have temporal power over the whole world, but a spiritual kingdom only; and he shows that the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of Christ, directly and properly does not have temporal power, but spiritual, although through it he can also govern temporal things, when spiritual necessity requires it. Thus also Durandus in his book on the origin of jurisdiction, question 3 in response to three arguments, says the following: It is necessary to say that the one who says that Christ did not have all spiritual and temporal power contradicts the gospel. And after that: After his resurrection Christ committed to Peter the whole government of the Church, inasmuch as it was necessary and needed to rule the whole Church, and because both the temporal and the spiritual power are necessary; therefore he conferred both on Peter. These are his words, and right after that he explains himself and says: These are the true limits of spiritual and temporal jurisdiction from the foundation of the Church, which are not permitted to be transgressed, because temporal jurisdiction in no way extends to spiritual things, about

which it knows nothing; but spiritual jurisdiction extends primarily and principally to spiritual things, secondarily and by a certain consequence it extends to the actions of men concerning those temporal things which are ordained to the spiritual as to their end. And after that he says: Because of that we do not intend to say that Christian rulers or kings have their lands from the Church, or their kingdoms in a feudal way, as at times certain people have falsely believed. But we only want to say exactly that the government of kings, and that of certain Christian rulers is subject to the rule of the Church in the sense that, if they adopt some kind of subversion of the faith or of good morals, correction of them by the law itself pertains to the Church. These are his words.

St. Bonaventure also in part 2, chapter 1 of his book on the ecclesiastical hierarchy writes that the Sovereign Pontiff can depose the emperor and kings, because he has supreme power in the Christian world; nevertheless he says in part 1, chapter 3 near the end of the same book that the power of bishops is purely spiritual, and that the power of kings is purely temporal. And in part 2, chapter 1 he repeats that the priestly power, and also that of the Sovereign Pontiff, is purely spiritual, but greater than the temporal, so that the temporal is subject to the spiritual, and not vice versa. This is the opinion and confession of all Catholics. Finally, while I omit more recent authors, the first who attribute temporal power by the institution of Christ to the Sovereign Pontiff seem to be Hugo of St. Victor in book 2, part 2, chapter 4 on the Sacraments and St. Bernard in book 4, chapter 4 on Consideration; those who followed them are Alexander, Bonaventure, Henry, Durandus, and some later authors. In addition Hugo writes that the temporal power of kings can be corrected and judged by the spiritual power, which resides especially in the Sovereign Pontiff. However, in the same place he writes in clear words that the king is the head of the temporal power, just as the pope is the head of the spiritual power. But St. Bernard in book 4 on Consideration says that both swords, the spiritual and the temporal, belong to the Sovereign Pontiff; nevertheless in many places in the same book he clearly proves that the power of the supreme Pontiff is really spiritual, not temporal (see book 1, chapter 5 on Consideration). Your power, he said in book 2, chapter 5), is over crimes, not over possessions. It may be, he said, that you lay claim to these other things for some reason (that is, temporal goods, which the Church has as a gift from earthly princes), but you do not have them by apostolic right, because he could not give you what he did not have (see chapter 6). I came into the world; for the world is a field, and it has been entrusted to you. I came into it not as Lord, but as a steward (see book 3, chapter 1). You have succeeded them (namely, the apostles) in the inheritance, so that you are the heir, and the world is the inheritance; but inasmuch as this portion pertains to you, or pertained to them, it must be pondered with a prudent consideration. For I think it does not pertain to you in every way, but only to the extent, as it seems to me, as some management over it has been given to you, but not the possession of it. Finally, in book 4, chapter 4 St. Bernard attributes both swords to the Church, but he places the spiritual sword in the hand of the pontiff, and the temporal sword in the hand of earthly princes. However, he does say that both pertain to the Church, especially because the temporal sword is subject to the spiritual, as will be explained in the following chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE POPE HAS SUPREME TEMPORAL POWER INDIRECTLY

The opinion of theologians is to be explained, and then also proved. Regarding the first point, we are saying that the Pontiff as pontiff, although he does not have any purely temporal power, still has in reference to the spiritual good the supreme power of managing the temporal affairs of all Christians. Many explain this by a similitude to the art of bridle-making and horsemanship, and similar things. For as those two arts are different from each other, because they have different objects and subjects, and actions; nevertheless, because the purpose of one is ordered to the purpose of the other, therefore one is above the other and prescribes the laws for it; so also ecclesiastical and political power seem to be different, and still one is subordinate to the other, because the purpose of one naturally determines the purpose of the other.

But this comparison is not wholly suitable; for in those arts the lower one is only for the sake of the higher one, so that if the higher one is removed, immediately also the lower one. For, if there is no equestrian art, certainly the art of bridle-making is superfluous. But political power is not just because of the ecclesiastical, for even if there were no ecclesiastical power, there would still be the political, as is evident among pagans, where there is true temporal and political power, but there is no order to any true ecclesiastical and spiritual power.

Therefore there is another comparison which is much more suitable for our need, by which Gregory Nazianzen explains this matter in his Oration to the people. And after him Hugh of St. Victor in book 2, part 2, chapter 4 on the Sacraments, Thomas Waldo in book 2, chapter 78 on the doctrine of the faith, John Driedo in book 2, chapter 2 on the freedom of Christians, Victoria and Soto in the place cited. For, just as there are in man both spirit and flesh, so also there are in the Church those two powers; for spirit and flesh are like two states which can be found to be both separate and joined. The flesh has sensation and appetites, to which certain acts and proportionate objects correspond, whose immediate end is the health and a good constitution of the body; the spirit has intellect and will, and acts and proportionate objects, and for its end the health and perfection of the soul; flesh is found without spirit in brute animals, and spirit is found without flesh in the angels.

From this it appears that neither is precisely because of the other. Flesh is found also joined to the spirit in man, where, because they make one person, necessarily they have subordination and connection: for the flesh is subject and the spirit presides. And although the spirit does not immerse itself in the actions of the flesh, but allows it to exercise all of its own actions, as it functions in brutes, nevertheless when they oppose the end of the spirit itself, the spirit commands the flesh and restrains it, and if it is necessary, it imposes fasts and other inflictions, also with a certain injury and weakening of the body itself, and it forces the tongue not to speak, the eyes not to see, etc. Similarly, if in order to obtain the end of the spirit, some operation of the flesh is necessary, and even death itself, the spirit can command the flesh to expend itself and all it has, as we see in the martyrs.

Thus purely political power has its own principles, laws, judgments, etc. and similarly

the ecclesiastical has its own bishops, canons, judgments. Sometimes they are found separate, as formerly in the time of the apostles, and sometimes they are joined together, as they are now; but when they are joined together they make one body; and therefore they must be connected, with the lower subjected to and subordinated to the higher. Therefore the spiritual does not involve itself in temporal affairs, but allows everything to proceed, as they did before they were joined together, provided that they are not opposed to the spiritual end, or are not necessary to obtain it. But if such a thing should happen, the spiritual power can and ought to correct the temporal with eveiy reason and means, which seems to be necessary for that purpose.

But so that we may explain all this in more detail, the spiritual power of the Pope should be compared with the persons of judges, or of secular rulers, with their civil laws, and with their forum and judgments.

With regard to persons, the Pope as pope cannot ordinarily depose temporal rulers, even for a just reason, in the way in which he deposes bishops, that is, as the ordinary judge; nevertheless he can change kingdoms, and take from one and confer on another, as the supreme spiritual ruler, if it is necessary for the salvation of souls, and still the kings do not want to do that; or if something else is dangerous for the salvation of souls, and still the kings do not want to abrogate it.

Therefore there is an excellent rule, which the Gloss records in the chapter "Possessor, de reg. jur. in Sexto," which says this: When concerning the same matter contrary imperial and ecclesiastical laws are found, if the matter of the law is something concerning the danger of souls, the imperial law is abrogated by the pontifical. And in this way the pontifical law, which is contained in the chapter "Fin. de praescript." abrogated the imperial law, which is found in the cod. de praescript. of 30 or 40 years ago, which could not be observed without moral sin. But when the matter of the law is some temporal thing not concerning the danger to souls, the pontifical law cannot abrogate the imperial law, but both are to be observed—the former in the ecclesiastical forum, the latter in the civil forum.

With regard to judgments, the Pope as pope ordinarily cannot judge material things; for, Bernard said rightly to Pope Eugene in book 4 on Consideration: *These meanest and earthly things have their own judges, kings and rulers of the earth. Why do you invade foreign territories? Why do you apply your sickle to someone else s harvest?* Likewise: *Your power is over crimes, not over possessions.* Nevertheless in a case in which it is necessary for the salvation of souls, the Pontiff can also take on temporal judgments, when there is no one else who can judge, as when two great kings contend with each other, or when those who can and ought to judge, do not want to make a judgment. Hence in the same place Bernard says: *It is one thing occasionally to get involved in such things, but something else to dedicate oneself to them as being worthy of your attention.* And Innocent III in the chapter "Per venerabilem" says that the Pontiff is to exercise temporal jurisdiction only accidentally.

CHAPTER VII

THE OPINION OF THEOLOGIANS IS PROVED BY REASONS

Therefore this opinion can be proved in two ways, by reasons and by examples.

The first reason is this. Civil power is subject to spiritual power, when both parts belong to the same Christian state; therefore the spiritual ruler can command the temporal rulers, and manage temporal affairs in reference to the spiritual good: for every higher power can command the lower power.

But political power not only, as Christian, but also as political is subject to the ecclesiastical power as such. First of all, this is demonstrated from the end of both. For, the end of the temporal is subordinated to the end of the spiritual, as is evident, because temporal happiness is not the absolutely ultimate end; and therefore it must be referred to eternal happiness; and it is certain from Aristotle in book 1, chapter 1 of his Ethics that the faculties are so subordinated as the ends are subordinated.

Secondly. Kings and Pontiffs, clerics and laity do not constitute two states, but one, that is, one Church; for we are all one body (see Rom. 12:5 and 1 Cor.12:12), but in every body the members are connected and dependent on one another. For it is not rightly said that the spirituals depend on the temporal; therefore the temporal depend on the spiritual, and are subject to them.

Thirdly. If the temporal administration hinders the spiritual good, in the judgment of all authors the temporal ruler is bound to change that way of administering, even with some damage to the temporal good; therefore the point is that the temporal power is subject to the spiritual.

And it would not suffice, if someone were to respond that that ruler is bound to change the nature of his administration, not because of subjection or subordination to the spiritual power, but only because of the order of charity, whereby we are bound to prefer the greater good to the lesser. For, because of the order of charity one state is not bound to suffer damage, lest another more noble state should suffer a similar damage. And one private person, who is bound to give all his goods for the preservation of his own state, is not bound to do the same thing for the sake of a foreign state, even if it is more noble. Therefore since the temporal state is bound to suffer some temporal damage for the sake of the spiritual, this is an indication that they are not two different things, but parts of one and the same reality, and one subject to the other.

Also, it is not true if someone says that the temporal prince is bound to suffer damage for the spiritual good, not because of subjection to the spiritual state, but because otherwise it would injure his subjects for whom it is evil to lose the spiritual in favor of the temporal. For although the non-subjects, but men of another kingdom, suffer a notable damage in spiritual matters, because of the administration of a temporal Christian king, he is bound to change his way of administering, and for this point no other reason can be given, except that they are members of the same body, and subject one to the other.

The second reason. The ecclesiastical state should be perfect, and self-sufficient in reference to its end; for such are all states that are well founded. Therefore it must have

all the power necessary to obtain its end; but the power of using and managing temporal things is necessaiy to obtain the spiritual end, because otherwise bad rulers could favor heretics with impunity, and destroy religion; therefore also she has this power.

Likewise. Any state can, because it must be perfect and self-sufficient, command another state not subject to itself, and force it to change the administration, indeed also to depose its ruler and install another, when it cannot otherwise defend itself against its injuries. Therefore much more can the spiritual state command the temporal state subject to itself, and force it to change its administration, and to depose rulers, and install others when otherwise it cannot defend its spiritual good. And it is in this way that the words of St. Bernard are to be understood as found in book 4 on Consideration and in the words of Boniface VIII in the Bull *"Unam sanctam,"* where they say that the two swords are in the power of the Pope. For, they want to signify that the Pontiff has per se and properly the spiritual sword, and because the temporal sword is subject to the spiritual, that the Pontiff can command the king, or prohibit the use of the temporal sword, when the necessity of the Church requires it. y l

For, these are the words of St. Bernard, which Boniface imitated: UTiy *are you* the said, addressing the Pope) *now trying to usurp the sword, which you were once ordered to put back in its sheath? He who denies your sword seems to me to not pay sufficient attention to the word of the Lord, who said this: Put your sword back into its sheath Therefore both swords belong to the Church, namely, the spiritual and the material the former is for the Church, but the latter is also to be exercised by the Church The fo belongs to the priest, the latter to the hand of the soldier, but only at the direction th priest and the command of the emperor.* There it should also be noted that, when the heretics attack the Bull of Boniface as erroneous, arrogant and tyrannical (for that is what they say about it passim), they should be warned that these are the same words of Bernard in his book on Consideration, but there he says without flatteiy, as Calvin savs in 4, chapter 11 § 10 in his Institutes, that Bernard is speaking in those books in such a wav that truth itself seems to be speaking.

The third reason. Christians are not allowed to tolerate an infidel or heretical kina if he attempts to draw his subjects to his heresy or infidelity, but it pertains to the Pontiff to judge whether or not the king is drawing them to the heresy, since the protection of religion has been committed to him; therefore it pertains to the Pontiff to iudee that ℤ king is to be deposed or not deposed. J ® l ine

The proposition of this argument is proved from Deut. 17:15, where the people are forbidden to elect a king who is not from among their brothers, that is of the Jews lest he lead the Jews into idolatty. Therefore Christians also are forbidden to elect à non-Christian king. For, that is a moral precept, and it is based on natural justice Again the danger is the same in electing a non-Christian and in not deposing a non-Christian' as has been pointed out. Therefore, Christians are bound not to allow a non-Christian' king to rule over them, if he tries to turn the people away from the faith. But I add this condition because of those pagan rulers, who had dominion over their people before the people were converted to the faith: if such rulers do not attempt to turn the people away from the faith, they could indeed be deprived of their power according to the opinion of

St. Thomas in II-II, q. 10, art. 10, but the Church does not always do that, either because she does not have the power, or because she judges it is not necessary. But if those same rulers try to turn the people away from the faith, all authors agree that they can and should be deprived of their power.

If Christians formerly did not depose Nero, and Diocletian, and Julian the apostate, and Valence the Arian and similar rulers, it was because the Christians did not have the temporal power to do so. For, that otherwise they could have done it justly is clear from the Apostle in 1 Cor. 6:1 ff., where he orders that new judges should be established to deal with temporal cases, so that Christians would not be forced to bring their cases before a judge persecuting Christ. For just as new judges could be established, so also new rulers and kings for the same reason, if the necessary force is present.

Moreover, to tolerate a heretical or infidel king trying to attract men to his own sect is to expose religion to an evident danger: *Like the ruler of the city, so are all its inhabitants* (Sir. 10:2); hence this also is true: *Like the magistrate of the people, so are his officials* (ibid.). And experience teaches the same thing; for, because Jeroboam was an idolatrous king, the greater part of his kingdom immediately began to worship idols (1 Kings 12:28ff.) and after the coming of Christ, while Constantine was reigning, the Christian faith flourished; while Julian was reigning, paganism flourished again; and in England during our time, under the reign of Henry and then Edward, the whole kingdom in a certain sense apostatized from the faith; when Maiy reigned, the whole kingdom again returned to the faith; when Elizabeth reigned, Calvinism again began to reign, and the true religion was banished.

But Christians are not bound, indeed they should not be bound to tolerate an infidel king, when there is evident danger to religion. For, when the divine law and human law conflict, the divine law must be observed, not the human law. But it is required by the divine law to preserve the true faith and religion, which is only one, not many; but it is according to human law that we have this or that king.

Finally, why cannot a faithful people be freed from the yoke of an infidel king, who is drawing the people to infidelity, if a faithful spouse is free from the obligation of remaining with an unbelieving spouse, when he does not want to remain with his Christian wife, without danger to the faith, as Innocent III openly deduces from 1 Cor. 7:15 in the chapter "Gaudemus"; for the power of a husband over his spouse is not less than that of a king over his subjects, but sometimes it is even greater.

The fourth reason. When kings and rulers come to the Church in order to become Christians, they are received with the express or tacit agreement that they subject their rule to Christ, and they promise that they will keep and defend the faith of Christ, even under the penalty of losing their kingdom. Therefore, when they become heretics or injure the faith, they can be judged by the Church, and also deposed from their position, and no injury is done to them if they are deposed. For, he is not fit for the sacrament of Baptism, who is not ready to serve Christ, and because of him to lose whatever he has. For the Lord says in Luke 14:26: *If any one comes to me and does not hate his own father and mother and wife and children and brothers and sisters, yes, and even his own life, he cannot be my disciple.* Moreover, the Church would very gravely err if she admitted

a king, who wanted with impunity to foster some sect, and to defend heretics, and to destroy religion.

The fifth reason. When Peter was told, *Feed my sheep* (John 21:21), every power was given to him, which a shepherd needs in order to protect his flock. But a shepherd needs a threefold power, namely, one concerning wolves, to keep them at a distance in every way possible; the second concerning rams, so that if they try to injure the flock with their horns, he can stop them so that they do not scatter the flock; the third concerns the remaining sheep, that he provide sufficient nourishment for each of them; therefore the Sovereign Pontiff has this threefold power.

Therefore, three arguments are taken from this place, and this is the first one. The wolves who lay waste the Church of the Lord are the heretics, as is clear from Matt. 7:15: *Beware of false prophets, etc.* Therefore if some ruler from being a sheep or ram becomes a wolf, that is, from being a Christian becomes a heretic, the pastor of the Church can keep him at a distance by excommunication, and at the same time order the people not to follow him; and therefore he can deprive him of his power over his subjects.

But there is a second argument. The shepherd can separate and drive away the raging rams who are destroying the flock. But a ruler is a raging ram destroying the flock, when he is a Catholic in faith, but so evil, that he is a great obstacle to religion and the Church, so that he sells bishoprics, plunders Churches, etc.; therefore the pastor of the Church can shut him out, or reduce him to the status of the sheep.

There is also a third argument. The shepherd can and should pasture all the sheep in such a way that is suitable for them. Therefore the Pontiff can and should order those things for all Christians, and urge them to so do the things that each one is bound to do according to his status, that is, to urge each one to serve God in the way he should according to his status in life; but kings should serve God by defending the Church, by punishing heretics and schismatics, as Augustine teaches in letter 50 to Boniface, Leo in letter 75 to Leo Augustus, and Gregory in book 2, letter 61 to Mauritius; therefore he can and ought to order kings to do this, and if they do not do it, also to force them by excommunication and by other suitable measures. For more on this see Nicholas Sanderus in book 2, chapter 4 on the visible monarchy, where you will also find many of the things which we have said here.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SAME POINT IS PROVED BY EXAMPLES

Now let us consider the examples. The first one is in 2 Chron. 26:16ff., where we read that King Uzziah, when he usurped the office of the priests, was expelled from the temple by the high priest; and when, because of the same sin, he was struck by God with leprosy, he was also forced to leave the city, and turn the kingdom over to his son. Now it is clear that he was deprived of the administration of his kingdom, not by his own will but because of the decree of the high priest; for we read in Lev. 13:44ff.: *Whoever is a leprous man, and is declared unclean by the priest, shall dwell alone outside the camp.* Therefore since this was the law in Israel, and at the same time we read in 2 Chron. 26 that the king dwelt outside the city in a house by himself, and that his son in the city judged the people of the land, we are forced to say that he was sent away by the decision of the priest, and therefore deprived of his authority to rule. Therefore if because of bodily leprosy the priest formerly judged the king, and deprived him of his kingdom, why can he not do it now because of spiritual leprosy, that is, because of heresy, which was prefigured by that leprosy, as Augustine teaches in book 2, question 40 in his treatise on gospel questions, especially since in 1 Cor. 10:11 Paul says everything happened to the Jews as a warning for us?

The second example is in 2 Chron. 23, where, since Athaliah had governed the kingdom in a tyrannical way, and promoted the worship of Baal, the priest Jehoiada called the captains and the soldiers and ordered them to kill Athaliah, which they did, and in her place he made Joash the king. But that the priest did not advise, but commanded this, is clear from what is said in 2 Kings 11:9: *The captains did according to all that Jehoiada the priest commanded.* Likewise from the words in 2 Chron. 23:14: *Then Jehoiada the priest brought out the captains and said to them: Bring her* (queen Athaliah) *outside the area of the temple and slay her there with the sword.* But that the reason for the deposition and death of Athaliah was not only her tyranny, but also that she promoted the worship of Baal is clear from these words, which are placed immediately after the record of her death: *Then all the people* (Scripture says) *went to the house of Baal, and tore it down; his altars and his images they broke in pieces, and they slew Mattan the priest of Baal before the altars.*

The third example is that of St. Ambrose who, since he was the bishop of Milan, and therefore the pastor and spiritual father of the Emperor Theodosius, who regularly resided in Milan, first excommunicated him because of the slaughter he had commanded to be done at Thessalonica by his soldiers; then he commanded him to pass a law, that the sentences passed, or the publication of the news about them, were not to be ratified, until after thirty days from the pronouncement of the sentence, so that indeed, if he had dictated something hastily out of anger, within the space of so many days he could revoke it. Theodoretus writes about this in book 5, chapter 17 of his history, but Ambrose could not excommunicate Theodosius because of that slaughter, unless he already knew about the case and had decided it, although it was criminal and pertained to the external forum;

but he could not know and judge a case of this kind unless he was also in the external forum the legitimate judge of Theodosius.

Moreover, to force an emperor to pass a political law, and to prescribe for him the form of the law—does this not manifestly show that the bishop at times can use his temporal power, even over those who have power over others? And if any bishop whatever can do this, how much more the head of all the bishops?

The fourth example is that of Gregory I in the privilege that he conceded to the monastery of St. Medard, and is mentioned at the end of his letter: *If any king,* he said, *or magistrate, or judge, or any other secular official should violate the decrees of our apostolic authority or our precepts, no matter what dignity or loftiness he may have, let him be deprived of his honor.*

The fifth is that of Gregory II, who forbade the iconoclast Emperor Leo, who had been excommunicated by him, to collect taxes from the Italians; and therefore he injured him in part of the empire. The Magdeburgenses recount this in Centuries 8, chapter 10 in the life of Gregory, but they reprimand him and say that he was a traitor to this own country; but they produce no author who blames him for this deed, while we, on the other hand, have many who praised his action as holy and legitimate, namely, Cedrenus, Zonaras in the life of Leo Isaurus, and all the other historians, who wrote about the things done during those times.

The sixth is that if Zachary who, having been asked by the leaders of the Franks, deposed Childericus, and in his place ordered that Pepin, the father of Charlemagne, should be made king. The reason for this was, because of the negligence of Childericus, extreme ruin seemed to threaten both religion and the kingdom in Gaul, as is clear from Cedrenus in his life of Leo Isaurus, Deacon Paul in book 6, chapter 5 on the history of the Langobards, and St. Boniface, bishop of Mainz, in his letter to Zachary.

The heretics also acknowledge this fact, and reprehend him, like the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 8, chapter 10, where they say that Pope Zachaiy shamelessly assumed for himself quasi divine authority. But among the ancient authors they could not find one severe critic of this fact; but we can cite many approvers, namely, Ado, Sigebert, Rheginus in the Chronicles, but about this matter we have said many things against Calvin in book 2, chapter 17.

The seventh example is that of Leo III, who transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, because the Greeks were not able to offer any assistance to the suffering Western Church. From this it came about that, although the imperial dignity considered absolutely does not come from the Pontiff, but from God, through the mediation of the law of nations, as we showed above from Gelasius, Nicholas and Innocent III, nevertheless the emperors who reigned from the time of Charlemagne owed their throne and power of commanding to the Pontiff.

For, the fact that this power now resides among the Germans is from the Pontiff. And although speaking absolutely it is not necessary that the Pope should confirm the emperor, or that the emperor should take an oath of fidelity to the Pontiff, still ever since the empire was transferred to the Germans both are required, as is clear from Innocent III in the chapter "Venerabilem, extra de elect, et ex Clementina unica, de jurejurando," and

this is not required unjustly. For, he who could confer the empire on the Germans because of the welfare of the Church, could also attach certain conditions for the same reason, that is, lest it happen that a heretic or schismatic would be chosen.

The adversaries give two responses to this example. For, some deny that it was done rightly that the Pontiff transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans, and among these are the Magdeburgenses, who in Centuries 8, chapter 10, col. 751 say this: *This translation is the principal miracle of the Antichrist.* Also Theodore Bibliander in tablet 10 of his Chronology says that Leo III, having usurped his authority, transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Germans. But other say it was done justly, but that the author of the translations was not the Pontiff, but the Roman people. Thus Marsilius of Padua according to Pighius in book 3, chapter 14 in his book on the Hierarchy of the Church.

To the first objectors I respond: it is very certain that this translation was done properly and legitimately. First, it is evident from the agreement of the whole Christian world. For, all Christians always considered Charlemagne and his successors to be true emperors; and there was no Christian king, who wanted to take precedence over the emperor, although in other ways he was before him in power and antiquity of reign. Lutherans are the first who, just as they robbed the people of their faith and religion, so also they are trying to remove the emperor from his throne. Secondly, from the happy results of this transferal; for, God showed that this was done justly by rewarding Charlemagne with many victories, and he made the kingdom flourish and be veiy helpful to the Church. Thirdly, from the admission of the Greek emperors, who more than once confessed that the Roman Pontiff justly could do what he did. For, first of all, when the Empress Irene heard that Charlemagne had been named emperor by Pope Leo, not only did she not object, but she also wanted to marry Charlemagne, and she would have done it, if certain perfidious eunuchs had not hindered her, as Zonaras and Cedrenus write in the life of this Irene.

Then, after the death of Irene, the Emperor Nicephorus, who had succeeded her, sent legates to Charlemagne as the Emperor, as Ado writes in the Chronicle for the year 803; and shortly thereafter, after Nicephorus died, Michael succeeded him and similarly sent legates to Charlemagne, who openly saluted him as the Emperor, as the same Ado writes in the Chronicle for the year 810. Not only the Greeks, but also the Persians sent legates and gifts to the Emperor Charlemagne soon after his appointment, as Rheginus in book 2 and Otto von Freising in book 5, chapter 31 write. Again (as Blondus says in book 5, chapter 2 and Platina in the life of Alexander III) the Emperor Emmanuel of the Greeks, when he heard that the Pontiff Alexander III had been reduced to extreme distress by the Emperor Frederick, offered help to the same Pontiff and a huge sum of money, if he would return the empire of the West to the Emperor in Constantinople. But the Pontiff responded that he did not want to join the two back together, which his predecessors purposely and with good reason had divided. There it should be noted that Emmanuel wanted nothing more from the Pontiff than the title of the empire; for he knew well enough that the possession itself could not be given by the Pontiff, but had to be obtained by force of arms. However, he would not have wanted to buy the title alone at such a

great price, if he believed it was worthless, or even false and illegitimate.

It is easy to respond to the others who say that the author of the translation was not the Pontiff, but the Roman people. For, first of all, the Roman people almost never had the power of creating an emperor, since the ancient emperors controlled the empire either by right of inheritance, like Octavian, Tiberias, Caius; or they were created by the army, as Claudius was created, Vespasian and others. And that this was the ordinary custom, that the emperor was named by the army, is proved by St. Jerome in his letter to Evagrius. Hence to prove this there is the canon "Legitimus," dist. 93. But at the time of Charlemagne there was no Roman army, which could make him the emperor. For in Italy there were only the armies of the Greeks and the Langobards, and they were hostile to Charlemagne and, as is evident, Charlemagne did not have the empire by right of inheritance.

Then, if the Romans had any authority in the choice of the emperor, they certainly lost it when the seat of the empire was transferred to Constantinople. For, after that for almost 500 years, that is, from Constantine the Great to Charlemagne, the senate and Roman people had nothing to do with the creation of an emperor.

Furthermore, all authors who write about this matter, like Zonaras and Cedrenus in the life of Irene, Deacon Paul in book 2 on Roman affairs, Ado in the Chronical for the year 800, Albert Kranizius in book 1, chapter 14 in the metropolis, Otto von Freising in book 5, chapter 31, Marianus Scotus, Hermann Contractus, Lambert, Sigebert, Rheginus, Palmerius, Blondus, and all the other chronologists and historians say that Leo III transferred the empire from the Greeks to the Franks or Germans. Innocent III teaches the same thing in the chapter "Venerabilem, de elect." *The right and power of this kind,* he said, *came to them from the apostolic See, which transferred the Roman Empire to the Germans in the person of Charlemagne.* And in the same place he adds that the princes in Germany openly acknowledge this. Also Charlemagne himself clearly signified the same thing, when he sent to Pope Leo his last will and testament written by himself, in which he designated his sons as heirs of the empire; he asked the Pope to confirm this with his own signature, as Ado writes in the Chronicle for the year 804. Finally, the same thing is clear from the Confession of the Greek Emperor Emmanuel, as was noted above.

The eighth example is that of Gregory V, who published a directive concerning the election of the emperor by seven German princes, which continues to be observed to this day. That this is so, besides Blondus in Decade 2, book 3, Nauclerus in generat. 34, Platina in the life of Gregory V and many other historians, it is affirmed also by the Magdeburgenses in Centuries 10, chapter 10, col. 546 in these words: *Gregory adorned his fatherland with an outstanding dignity, and decreed that the right of electing the king would be in the hands of the Germans alone who, after the crown had been received from the Roman Pontiff, is called the August Emperor. The designated electors are the archbishops of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier, the Count Palatine of the Rhine, the Duke of Saxony, the Margrave of Brandenburg, and the King of Bohemia.* But whether the Pontiff did that justly and legally, they do not say. But if they admit it was done justly, then they are forced to admit that the Pontiff is above the emperor and all the princes, as is evident. But if they say it was not done justly, but tyrannically, then they are inflicting an injury

on their patrons and protectors, namely, the Duke of Saxony, the Count Palatine, and the Margrave of Brandenburg. For what do they have that is greater than the right to vote? But they do not have it justly, if the one who gave it could not give it: but that the Pontiff gave it, is beyond all controversy.

However, it should be noted here that Onuphrius on the court of the emperor, contrary to the common view of historians, wrote that this directive on the election of the emperor was published not by Gregory V, but by Gregory X. Although this does not damage the matter we are now considering, still I think it is not true. For, Innocent III, who reigned 70 years before Gregory X, in the chapter "Venerabilem, de elect." indicates that already for a long time the right of electing the emperor was granted by the apostolic See to certain German princes; and Henry Hostiensis, who also lived before the time of Gregory X, in his comments on this chapter says that Innocent is speaking about the seven electors. And Pelagius Alvarus, who lived a short time after the time of Gregory X, knew eveiything that Gregoiy X did; nevertheless, in book 1, art. 41 on the lamentation of the Church he says that Gregory V instituted the election of the emperor, which is now in use, and in the same place he lists the seven electors, whom we named above.

The ninth example is that of Gregory VII, who deposed the Emperor Henry IV, and ordered that another one be elected, and this was done, as even the Magdeburgenses admit in Centuries 11, chapter 10 in the life of Gregory VII. But that this was done rightly, and with the approval and applause of all good men, we showed in the previous book, where we defended some pontiffs against the calumnies of the heretics.

The tenth example is that of Innocent III, who similarly deposed Otto IV, as is clear from Blondus in Decade 2, book *6.*

The eleventh is that of Innocent IV, who in the first general Council of Lyons, with the consent of all the Fathers, deposed Frederick II, and left the throne of the empire vacant for 28 years, as Matthew Palmerius records in his Chronicle. The whole decree passed against Frederick still exists in the chapter "Ad apostolicae, de sent, et re iudic. in 6." Also the same Innocent IV gave a coadjutor to the king of Portugal, who would administer the kingdom, since because of the negligence of the king, both the state and religion in Portugal were put in danger. This is explained in the chapter "Grandi, de suppl. neglig. Praelat in 6."

The twelfth example is that of Clement VI, who deposed the Emperor Louis IV, who had been excommunicated by John XXII and Benedict XII. On his history see Pighius in book 5, chapters 14 and 15 on the hierarchy of the Church and Robert Arboricensis in tome 2 on the two swords.

The arguments of the adversaries have been answered partly in book 2 on the Roman Pontiff and partly they can be answered easily from what has been said. See John a Turrecremata in book 2, the last two chapters of his Summa and Albert Pighius in book 5, chapter 15; they answer some of the trivial and easy arguments.

CHAPTER IX

THAT ONE MAN IS AT THE SAME TIME BOTH AN ECCLESIASTICAL AND A POLITICAL RULER DOES NOT CONFLICT WITH THE WORD OF GOD

Regarding the third part of the question, the adversaries teach two things about the temporal power of the Sovereign Pontiff. The first is that his possession of it is the result of pure thievery. The second is that, even if he has it by a just title, he cannot rightly retain it, because it conflicts with his spiritual power. This is what Calvin says in book 4, chapter 11 § 8 and 11 of his Institutes. It will be necessary that we prove both points, that is, that such power can be fitting for the Pontiff, and really that he can have and possess it, and that he does have and possess it.

Therefore, that it is not repugnant that the Pontiff is at the same time the spiritual and temporal ruler of some province, is proved first of all by the examples of the saints, who are found to have been kings and rulers. For, in the law of nature Melchizedek was king and priest, as is clear from Gen. 14 and Heb. 7; indeed also formerly the first-born was king and priest, as St. Jerome says in the Hebrew questions on the words in Gen. 49:3: *Reuben, you are my first-born.* Also it is certain that Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob presided over both the things that pertained to religion and the things that pertained to political life.

Then Moses was both the supreme temporal ruler and the high priest, as is evident from the divine writings. For, in Exod. 18:13 it is said: *Moses sat to judge the people.* And in chapter 32:27 he commanded many people to be killed because of the sin of idolatry, and in chapter 40:27 he offered incense to the Lord, which was especially the proper office of the high priest, as is clear from 2 Chron. 26:18. Likewise in Lev. 8 Moses consecrated Aaron a priest, he sanctified the tabernacle and the altar, he offered sacrifices and holocausts, which only a priest can do. Therefore, Philo in book 3 on the life of Moses, in the last words said: *This is the life, this is the end of Moses, who was king, lawgiver, priest, prophet.* And Gregory Nazianzen in the Oration for Gregory of Nyssa said: *Moses, prince of princes, priest of priests, used Aaron for his tongue.* Finally, Augustine on the reign of Moses says in q. 68 on Exodus: *Moses sat alone to judge, while all the people were standing.* But on his priesthood in question 23 on Leviticus he said: *Both Moses and Aaron were high priests.*

Moreover, Elijah was both high priest and political judge for 40 years, as is clear from 2 Kings 1 and 4. Finally, the Maccabees Judas, Jonathan, Simon and John and others until Herod were at the same time priests and political leaders, as is evident from the books of Maccabees and from Josephus in book 12 and following of his Antiquities.

It is proved by a second reason. First, ecclesiastic and political power are not contrary, but both are good, both are from God, both are praiseworthy, and one serves the other; therefore they do not conflict with each other; therefore they can be together in the same person.

Secondly, peace and war are more different than temporal and spiritual goods. But one and the same king at the same time presides over the senate and the army, citizens

and soldiers; therefore much more can one person preside over temporal and spiritual things.

Thirdly, one king can govern different kingdoms, which have different customs, rituals and laws; and for the same reason one bishop can govern several Churches, as is clear concerning the ancient patriarchs (not to mention the Roman), each one of which had several bishops under him. Therefore also one man can rule one diocese and one province. For it is either more difficult to govern a diocese than a province, or it is easier, or equally difficult. If the first, then if one man governs two dioceses, he can also govern one diocese and one province; if the second, then if one person governs two provinces, he can easily govern one province and one diocese; if the third, if one person governs two provinces, or two dioceses, then he can likewise govern one diocese and one province.

Fourthly, those who have given temporal territories to the Roman Bishop and to other bishops are pious men, and for that reason especially they have been praised by the whole Church, as is clear concerning Constantine and Charlemagne and his son Louis, who because of that was called Pious, and even the adversaries praise them. On the other hand, those who have tried to take those territories away from them, like Aistulphus the King of the Langobards, Henry IV and V, Otto IV, Frederick I and II are referred to by all historians as impious and sacrilegious.

Concerning Aistulphus, Ado in the Chronicle for the year 727 writes the following: *Aistulphus, the treacherous king of the Langobards, broke the covenants made by his predecessors to Blessed Peter, and gave the possessions of the Roman Church to his soldiers.* And after that: *Aistulphus, a treacherous man, spoke only lies.* And then after that: *Aistulphus by the judgment of God, while he was hunting, suddenly was struck and died.* Also St. Bernard in letter 242 to the Romans strongly blames the Romans, because they had separated themselves from Pope Eugene. The reason for this separation was, according to Platina and other historians, because the Romans did not want to be subject to the Pontiff in temporal affairs, but as in the old days, they wanted the state to be governed by consuls. On Henry IV see what we said above in book 4, chapter 13.

And not only were they excellent rulers, who in this way enriched the apostolic See, but also many of them who received assistance of this kind and preeminence. For, Platina writes that Leo IV was famous for his miracles. All the authors call Leo IX a saint, and Sigebert and Otto von Freising write that he was illustrious for his miracles. Lambert von Schaffhaburg writes that Gregory VII was famous for miracles and that he was an excellent man; we said much about him in the previous book. Bishop Peter ab Aliaco describes the holy life of Celestine V, who performed many miracles. Finally, all the authors praise Adrian, I, Leo III, Nocholas I, Innocent III and several others; and it is quite certain that they administered this territory together with the pontificate.

Finally, it is proved by experience. For, although perhaps absolutely it would be better for Pontiffs to deal only with spiritual things, and kings with temporal, still, because of the evil times, experience tells us loud and clear that it is not only useful, but also necessary, and a sign of the special providence of God, that some temporal territories were given to the Pontiff and to other bishops. For if in Germany the bishops had not been rulers, to this day no one would have remained in their dioceses. Therefore, just as

in the Old Testament for a long time the priests did not have any temporal power, and still in the last times religion could not be maintained and defended, unless the priests were also kings, namely, during the time of the Maccabees, so also we see that it has happened to the Church that in the early days in order to defend her authority she did not need temporal power, now it seems that she does need it.

Indeed that the Sovereign Pontiff justly has the territory which he has can be proved easily, because he has it as a gift from princes. For thus writes Deacon Paul about the deeds of the Langobards in book 6, chapter 26. Aripertus, King of the Langobards, restored the donation of the patrimony of the Cottian Alps, which formerly had belonged to the apostolic See, but had been occupied by the Langobards for a long time, and he sent this donation, written with gold letters, to Rome. Bede in his book on the six ages mentions the restitution or donation of this property. Also, Ado says this in the Chronicle for the year 727: *Moreover, King Pepin handed over Ravenna and the whole Pentapolis to the holy apostles Peter and Paul.* And there exists in the decree of Gratian, in dist. 63, the constitution of Louis I, the son of Charlemagne, in this form: *I, Louis, the August Emperor of the Romans, establish and concede by this treaty our confirmation to you, Blessed Peter, prince of the apostles, and through you to your vicar, the Sovereign Pontiff and his successors in perpetuity, as by your predecessors until now they have been in your power, and you have held in your power and governed: the City of Rome, and the suburbs, and its mountain territories, and the shores, and the ports, and all the cities, castles, towns and villas in the parts of Tuscany.*

Likewise Bishop Leo of Ostia in book 1, chapter 9 in his Chronicle said: *The same famous king* (Pepin) *with his sons made a concession to Blessed Peter and his vicar of the cities of Italy and its territories with designated borders: From Luna with the island of Corsica to Suranus, the mountain of Bardo, Vercetum, Parma, Regium, Mantua, and the mountain Silicis, together with the whole exarchate of Ravenna, as it always was, with the provinces of Venice and Histriae, and the whole duchy of Spoleto and Benevento.* And after that: *Then the same king, together with the Roman Pontiff came to Italy and subjected to the apostolic See Ravenna, and another twenty cities that had been occupied by the above-mentioned Aistulphus.* The same Leo in book 3, chapter 48 said: *In the year of the Incarnation of the Lord 1079 the Countess Matilda, fearing the army of the Emperor Henry, devoutly offered the provinces of Liguria and Tuscany to Pope Gregory.* Authentic documents of these and similar donations exist in Rome. But even if none of these documents existed, the prescription of 800 years would suffice abundantly. For, even kingdoms and empires acquired by theft, eventually after a long period of time become legitimate; for otherwise by what right did Julius Caesar occupy the Roman Empire? And nevertheless at the time of Tiberius Christ says in Matt. 22:21: *Render therefore to Caesar the things that are Caesars.* By what right did the Franks invade Gaul, the Saxons Great Britain, the Goths Spain? And nevertheless who today would say that the kingdoms established by them are illegitimate?

CHAPTER X

THE CONTRARY ARGUMENTS ARE REFUTED

Now we will answer the objections. First, Calvin raises an objection in book 4, chapter 11 §8 in his Institutes concerning Matt. 20:25: *You know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them; it shall not be so among you. For the Lord is signifying* (Calvin said) *not only that the office of a pastor is different from the office of a ruler, but that these things are more separated, so that they cannot coexist in one man.* And since Calvin saw that the example of Moses could be an objection to his position, he added this: *For, that Moses at the same time held both offices was brought about first of all by a rare miracle; then it was only temporary, until the matter was better arranged. But when a certain form is prescribed by the Lord, the civil government is left to Moses, and he is commanded to give the priesthood to his brother, and rightly so; for it is beyond nature that one man should carry both burdens.*

I will respond in two ways. First, I say that the Lord here is instituting only purely ecclesiastical leaders, and is teaching that they should as such govern their subjects, not in the way of kings and lord, but in the way of fathers and pastors; however, it does not follow from this that one and the same person cannot be a bishop and a ruler.

But the example of Moses, which Calvin tries to elude, is totally convincing. For what he says, namely, that it was done by a rare miracle, is shown to be manifestly false from the examples given by Melchizedek, Elijah, Judas Maccabeus and others. What he also adds—that it was done only temporarily, until Aaron was consecrated, St. Augustine shows is false in his question 23 on Leviticus. There he says that both of them were priests at the same time, Moses and Aaron, and it is proved from the fact that Moses deposed Aaron as priest, and consecrated Eleazar, Aaron's son, in his place, as is recorded in Num. 20:25ff. Moreover, if after the ordination of Aaron, ruling and the priesthood could not be found together in one person, how is it that Elijah for 40 years was both priest and ruler? How could the Maccabees do the same for more than 100 years?

Secondly, I say that the Lord with those words is not forbidding bishops to rule, as can be the case with pious kings and rulers, but as it is with kings ignorant of God, who often are tyrants rather than kings; this is evident from the meaning of the Greek words. For, Matthew does not say: κυριεύουσιν άυτων, that is, they exercise authority, but κατακυριεύουσιν, that is, they exercise authority violently. As in 1 Peter 5:3: *Not domineering over those in your charge,* the Greek is: μηδ' ώς κατακυριεύοντες των κληρον, and in Josh. 15:16 we read: *Caleb said: whoever smites Kiriath-sepher, and takes it,* in Greek is και κατακυριεύσει αυτής, that is, and has captured it with force, etc. Hence in 2 Pet. 2:10 and in Jude 8 we see that heretics are reprimanded, because they despise κυριότητα.

Secondly, in the same place in § 9 he raises an objection from Luke 12:14: *Man, who made me a judge or divider over you?* The Lord rejects the office of judging as not in accordance with his office of preacher and minister of the word, as also the apostles said in Acts 6:2: *It is not right that we should give up preaching the word of God to serve*

tables. But one who is a ruler cannot reject these duties.

It could be responded to these words of the Lord that the Lord in this world assumed the person of a priest, not of a temporal ruler, and with these words is warning priests not to get involved in secular affairs. But a better answer is that generally in both texts priests and rulers are being warned that they should not get so involved in small and common matters that they are forced to omit important things. In accord with this, when Jethro saw that Moses sat judging for the whole day (Exod. 18:14ff.), he wisely advised him, not that he should abandon his political power and apply himself only to the ecclesiastical, and that he should appoint lower judges, who would take care of smaller matters for the people, and refer to him the more serious matters, both political and ecclesiastic.

Thus finally the apostles in Jerusalem did omit serving tables, but in such a way that they could also preside over temporal matters for the whole Church. Hence in Gal. 2:10 Peter, and James and John, being concerned about the brothers who were in Jerusalem, asked Paul and Barnabas to remember to take up a collection of alms and send it to Jerusalem. That is what they did, and they themselves gave the collected money, not to the deacons serving tables, but to the elders, as is recorded in Acts 11:30.

Thirdly, he raises an objection in the same place in § 11 because of what St. Bernard says in book 2 on Consideration: *The apostles are forbidden to practice domination. Therefore you should not usurp for yourself an apostolate of domination. The apostolic rule is this—domination is forbidden, service is required.*

I respond that Bernard is speaking about the Pontiff as he is the pontiff of the whole Church, and according to what it has from the institution of Christ. For, shortly before that he had said: *Let it be that you lay claim to these other things for a good reason, but not by you apostolic right, for it could not give you what it did not have, etc.* Therefore, Bernard desires that the Pontiff as he is the shepherd of the sheep should not dominate over them, but feed them. But nevertheless as a political ruler rules the same sheep since they are citizens of the state, so also the Pontiff-can rule them for the same reason, if he is also their political ruler.

Fourthly, he raises an objection in the same place in § 14 from the words of St. Gregory, who in book 4, letter 44 declares an anathema on the bishop who orders that a claim should be imposed on a man's field by way of a tax.

I respond that it is not surprising, if Gregory did not want bishops, and also the overseers of the patrimonies of the Roman Church, to make use of a title in order to recover fields belonging to the Church. For, the Church did not yet have political authority, but she possessed temporal goods in the same way that private citizens do. Therefore it was right that she should seek by a legitimate judgment the return of fields, which she knew belonged to her, if in some way they had been occupied by others, but she could not claim them for herself by her own authority because of money owed to the treasury.

Others raise an objection based on 2 Tim. 2:4: *No one fighting for God gets entangled in civilian pursuits;* these words are said to a bishop, but a ruler must involve himself in civilian pursuits.

I respond that civilian pursuits in this place are not called political government, but the care of preparing food, and therefore wholesale business and merchandise, and

similar things. For in Greek it is: του βίου πραγματείας, that is, the necessities of life, or food. There also it should be noted that, in the Greek and in all the Latin codices the word "God" is not present, but generally it reads: ούδεις στρατευόμενος εμπλέκεται ταις του βίου πραγματείαις. And the meaning is: *I said that you should work like a good soldier of Christ.* Also, a good soldier is not anxious about food and the care of the body, but he eats and drinks when he can, and as he can; he sleeps on the ground, he is clothed more with metal than with normal clothing, etc. Therefore the Apostle does not forbid political government, but too much anxiety about the life of the body; and, as Chrysostom well says, these things are said by Paul to both the bishop and other men. For all, including lay persons, and even kings, should be soldiers of Christ.

Sixthly, they make an objection from the words of Nicholas I in a letter to Michael, where he says that, before the coming of Christ, kings and priests were the same, but that Christ separated a true king from a priest: *But as soon as it came to (be a matter of) the (one who was) at once true king and pontiff, the emperor no longer arrogated to himself the rights of the pontiff, nor did the pontiff usurp the name of the emperor, etc.*

I respond that Nicholas did not want to deny that a certain temporal power can be fitting for the Pontiff. For, he was the Pontiff, and at the same time he was the political ruler of Rome and Ravenna, and the other cities, which long ago his predecessors had received from the emperors, but he only wanted to say that it is not fitting that the same man should be the Pontiff of the whole world, and at the same time also the emperor of the whole world. This is not because it is opposed to the gospel, and could in no way happen, but because Christ, in order to preserve humility, wanted the Pontiff to need the protection of the emperor in temporal affairs, and at the same time that the emperor should need the guidance of the Pontiff in spiritual matters. But that Christ willed this is clear from the fact that he left the empire to Tiberius, and on Peter he conferred only the pontificate.

End of the third general Controversy

LAUS DEO, VIRGINIQUE MATRI MARIAE